The New REPUBLIC

A Journal of Opinion

LIBRARY
STATE TEACHERS COLLEGE
JOHNSON CITY, TENNESSEE

VOL. LXXXXI NEW YORK, WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 4, 1937 NUMBER 1183

Contents

The Week 345

Editorials

Roosevelt's Strategic Retreat 347
Is the Wagner Labor Law Unfair? 348
The Right to Work 350

General Articles

Soviet China: I ..... Edgar Snow 351
The Court Sees a New Light .... Edward S. Corwin 354
Military Lessons from Spain ..... Liddell Hart 357
Birthday Balance Sheet ..... Bruce Bliven 359
Daniel (verse) ..... Marguerite Young 360
Washington Notes ..... T. R. B. 361
Other People's Money ..... John T. Flynn 362
Burlesque Needs ..... Stark Young 363
The Bandwagon 364

Correspondence 364

Books in Review

Taking the Marxist Dialectic Apart ..... Edmund Wilson 366
Northwest Anchorage (verse) ..... Mary Barnard 368
Imperialist by Birth ..... Solomon F. Bloom 369
Pan's Parlor Game ..... Philip Horton 369
Ancient History in China ..... Lin Yutang 370
Seeing America First ..... Kathryn Coe Cordell 371
The Return of Peer Gynt ..... Michael Sayers 371
Restless Life ..... Joe Gould 371

The Week

ON ALTERNATE days during the week ending July 27 the dispatches from the Far East brought (a) news that the quarrel between Japan and China had been settled, (b) news that the quarrel had not been settled and that war was imminent. Reports of the latter kind are the latest as we go to press. Apparently the Nanking government is determined to resist Japanese alienation of Hopei and Chahar Provinces, the local generals will not make a separate agreement with Japan, and Japan intends to proceed with her military penetration. . . . In Spain the great battle west of Madrid went on with intensified fighting; the fortunes of war have shifted from day to day. Victory for either side would be a major event in the war, but while for the rebels a decisive defeat might be the beginning of the end, it would scarcely be so for the government. . . . In London the powers were still dickering indecisively about the final British proposal to salvage the non-intervention agreement. . . . The campaign against suspected opponents of the government continued in the Soviet Union, with more arrests and executions, and a drive against the press. . . . In France Premier Chautemps declared his intention to continue with economies in order to balance the budget, in spite of opposition from the Left elements in the People's Front. . . . Hitler kept on throwing Protestant ministers into prison, and they kept on defying him.

ATTENTION was concentrated in the United States upon the President's decision not to continue the fight for the Supreme Court reform. The bill was sent back to committee, to be reported out again without the Supreme Court feature, but retaining most of the proposed changes in lower federal courts. . . . Senator Barkley of Kentucky, a dependable liberal, was elected official Democratic leader, by a margin of one vote over Senator Pat Harrison of Mississippi. . . . Speculation began as to whether the President would appoint a new Supreme Court Justice to replace Van Devanter before Congress adjourns and, if so, whom he would appoint. . . . Senators La Follette and Barkley spent the week-end in the presidential yacht, and it was inferred that he was thus preparing to coördinate progressive support. . . . A movement began among conservatives to bring about the adjournment of Congress without passage of five bills desired by the President. . . . The CIO organizing campaign continued without any spectacular new strikes; it made advances particularly in textiles, transit and shipping. . . . Labor Board hearings brought out facts proving employer-supported violence against labor in the cases of Ford and Republic Steel. . . . The A.F. of L. reported that since the organization of the CIO it had gained 600,000 members; the CIO has been gaining members so fast that it has no figures to issue.

ONCE again, there is a wave of propaganda in the conservative press for an immediate adjournment of Congress. We are being told that the members of House and Senate have exhausted themselves by the Court battle, that they are elderly and frail, that Washington in summer is unendurably hot. We might have more respect for this propaganda if we had not heard it so often before; there has not been a single session of Congress since 1932 that has not been implored by the tories to shut up shop and go home, and we have occasionally had such appeals even in the days of the quiescent Coolidge. As a

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

matter of fact, the health of Congress is surprisingly good considering the age of most of its members and the habits of some. Midsummer heat is better endured in air-conditioned legislative chambers than in the members' homes. Very few members of the national legislature work hard enough at any time to impair their health; even the late Senator Robinson might have died when he did if Congress had not been in session at all. There are five subjects of great importance awaiting congressional action: low-cost housing, the wages-and-hours bill, control of agriculture, the creation of new regional developments like the TVA and reorganization of the government. We see no reason why the present session should not continue until these bills are passed.

FOR more than four years the federal government has been talking about housing but doing precious little about it. Now the Wagner-Steagall bill has been favorably reported to the Senate, though the House Banking and Currency Committee has thus far stubbornly refused to report it out. Washington correspondents say that it will pass both Houses without difficulty when it comes to a vote. The bill would lend $700,000,000 in three years to local housing authorities for construction of new dwelling places for low-income groups. Loans will be at the going federal interest rate, at present less than three percent. In addition, there will be annual subsidies up to 3.5 percent of the development cost of each project. These subsidies will probably meet all, or nearly all, of the interest charges. It is estimated that $26,000,000 will pay for the annual subsidies for three years. This is the total cost to the government, since the $700,000,000 is an amply secured loan. In other words, we can make a fine beginning at a housing program for a cost of under $9,000,000 a year—less than one one-hundredth of what we spend each year on our army and navy.

PERSONS who were mystified by Senator Gerald P. Nye's sudden blast against the National Labor Relations Board in newspapers of July 23 will be interested in a copyrighted story of the circumstances surrounding the issuing of the statement published three days later in The New York Post. According to The Post, Senator Nye admitted that the "unfairness" of the NLRB—about which he complained in his statement, even going so far as to say that the average citizen regards the Board as an "adjunct" of the CIO—was called to his attention by Sam Jones, a Washington publicity agent. Mr. Jones is identified as the publicity man who acted as stage manager for the press conference at which Tom M. Girdler, chairman of the board of the Republic Steel Corporation, distinguished himself for the violence of his attacks on labor and administration officials. Senator Nye denies that he knew of any connection between Jones and Republic Steel at the time the statement was issued. The Post points out, however, that virtually everyone else in Washington knew of Jones's previous efforts on Girdler's behalf. There is the further awkward fact, as reported in The Post, that copies of Senator Nye's statement were issued from Jones's office at least one hour before the Senator's own copy reached the Senate Press Gallery, and the odd "coincidence" that the statement was issued at a time when the Board was conducting a hearing on charges against Republic Steel.

WHATEVER anyone may think about Mr. Walter Lippmann's opinions, nobody could question the lucidity of his style. On that account we do not think we misunderstood his two letters to the American Newspaper Guild. He publicly refuses to pay his dues, and he does this in order to compel the Guild, as bound by its constitution, to throw him out. He refuses to pay, not because he hasn't money enough, but because he disapproves of resolutions adopted by the Guild at its recent convention. This seems to us a devious procedure; he certainly has ample facilities to make known his disapproval, and if he wanted to go farther than making a statement, he could also resign. Without quibbling over this point, however, let us continue. His objection to the resolutions in question—which approved the President's Supreme Court bill, supported the Spanish government, etc.—is not that they prevent him from writing as he pleases. Members may still, as always, express their own opinions—or their employers' opinions—in their writings. The assurance of the Guild on this point he says does not interest him. Nor is his objection that he disagrees with the opinions expressed; he disapproves of any expression of opinion by the Guild on public questions. Why? That is where his lucidity stops; we are left to guess. Only two suppositions seem open, and neither of them is flattering to Mr. Lippmann as a high-grade political philosopher. One is that unions as unions are not affected by and have no legitimate opinions about such things as the nature and decisions of the Supreme Court or the advance of fascism in the world. The other is that these delicate subjects should be left exclusively to an élite who write signed columns for the newspapers.

THE latest development in the Scottsboro case is in some ways the most shocking in its whole history. Four of the nine defendants have now been set free, and were promptly hurried out of the state in well justified fear of a lynching. Of the other five, one has been sentenced to death, one to ninety-nine years' imprisonment and two to seventy-five years each. The ninth has received twenty years, mostly because of an attack he made on a deputy sheriff. Four of these boys are now free after six and one-half years in prison. They get no apology and no recompense. The fact that they are now free is good news from the humanitarian point of view. But what of the other five, with sentences ranging from twenty years to death? The testimony on which they were convicted was precisely the same as that on which their four co-defendants have been set free. If one is innocent, by the state of Alabama's own position, all are.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The truth is that the present outcome is a bald political compromise. The death sentence will probably be commuted to a prison term, and after a few years all five of the remaining defendants will be set free. This is Alabama's way of admitting to the world that the Scottsboro defendants never had a fair trial, that they are in all human probability innocent.

PROBLEMS that have arisen from the mechanization of bituminous-coal production are the subject of a two-year study that is being carried on in the Appalachian area, by a joint commission composed of operators in the affected area and members of the United Mine Workers' Union. There is no doubt that the study ought to prove of great value. It marks a step forward in a new policy of trade unionism; the technique of meeting the problem of labor displacement in a scientific spirit instead of fighting blindly against it. Recently, however, we have heard a rumor to the effect that the mine operators, who agreed at the outset to coöperate in the study, are doing everything in their power to disturb the progress of research. One form their antagonism has taken is a personal attack on Walter N. Polakov, who heads the UMW's engineering staff, in the hope that the results of the study will, by inference, be regarded as inconclusive. There is, of course, no ground for the attack, and the very fact that the mine operators have found it necessary to sabotage the study would seem to indicate that its conclusions are of value.

W. R. HEARST is continuing his retreat. A few weeks ago, he suspended The New York American, flagship of his fleet of dailies. Shortly thereafter, he withdrew entirely from Rochester, leaving that city to Frank E. Gannett. At the same time, he curtailed his activities in Albany through an agreement with the same Mr. Gannett, so that Hearst now has only a morning paper, and the only morning paper, in that city. Now comes the news that he has entirely withdrawn from Washington, D. C. He has leased his Washington Times to Eleanor Patterson, having done the same thing with his Herald last April. For the next five years both these papers will be entirely in Mrs. Patterson's control. This latest move is in some ways the most surprising of all. Hearst has regarded his Washington papers as of tremendous importance because they could be read by members of the House and Senate engaged in legislation. Did he find that these gentlemen refused to read typical Hearst products? To this question must be added another: What is the SEC going to do about Hearst's application for the right to sell new debentures worth $35,500,000 to the public? Reasons for approving his request get increasingly scarce.

THROUGH a slip of the pen, Mr. Irving Brant referred, in the second of his two articles on the liberalism of Mr. Chief Justice Hughes, to a Supreme Court action setting aside a Wisconsin order reducing telephone rates. As the context made clear, the case in question should have been that of West v. the Chesapeake and Potomac Telephone Company.

WE ARE happy to announce the end of the depression. The exact date, if you are curious, was some time during the week or two before July 26. How do we know? Big Apple. It was on that date that the front pages of the nation's daily journals blossomed forth with the news of Big Apple, the lately invented dance that is sweeping the country. Big Apple—as if you didn't know—is a combination of old-fashioned square dance and ultra-modern swing. The dancers stand in a circle, applauding in rhythm as two by two or four by four, their members advance to the middle and do their stuff: the Charleston, the drag, truckin', the Lindy Hop, or anything else you can think of. Suddenly, all this is changed; at the word of the announcer, the dancers break into a Virginia reel or some other old-fashioned square dance, no holds barred. Only a country restored to exuberant health could toss off a Big Apple so casually as this. Gentlemen, the Republic is saved.

Roosevelt's Strategic Retreat

IN ABANDONING the battle for his Supreme Court proposal, in the face of determined opposition from a large number of Representatives and Senators, President Roosevelt has undoubtedly suffered a severe blow to his political prestige. More important than this defeat, however, which may turn out to be only temporary, are two other questions: first, what is the result as far as the Court itself is concerned, and second, what will follow in the struggle for further progressive legislation?

The interpretation read into the event by conservatives is certainly far too simple. This amounts to saying, in the first place, that the independence of the judiciary has been preserved against tampering and we are going to have the same good old Supreme Court in the future, and second, that the influence of the President and his ideas has now passed the apex, and there will be a resurgence of traditionalism that will prevent any more legislation with a leftward tinge.

The influence of the fight for the bill on the existing members of the Court is of course a subject for mere speculation; nevertheless it is undeniable, as Professor Corwin points out in his article in this issue of The New Republic, that the Court in its recent session made a right-about-face on a number of important constitutional issues. Mr. Irving Brant, in his two articles on Mr. Chief Justice Hughes in previous numbers, made clear that this able jurist seems far from being insensitive to the strength of liberal pressure. We think it a safe guess that the Court proposal had a good deal to do with the reversal of constitutional direction which the Chief Justice led in the first half of this year. Thus the constitutional purists did not prevent the President

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and his followers from "tampering" with the Court in a highly important way, by effectively bringing to bear upon it the popular demand for a more progressive view of governmental powers.

Will the Court follow this lead in the future? That depends, of course, not merely on the Chief Justice, but also on the economic predilections of the rest of the Court. Mr. Justice Van Devanter's resignation created a vacancy in the conservative ranks. By appointing a liberal to the vacancy Mr. Roosevelt could turn an uncertain five-to-four liberal majority into a much more reliable six-to-three one. If Hughes should later desert his new-found principles, he would be in a minority, unless Roberts joined him. Even that eventuality would be made impossible if another conservative should retire and be replaced by another liberal—an event that seems likely to happen before very long, especially now that the pressure for retirement has been removed by the recommitment of the bill. Thus in the normal course of events the President is almost certain to get the kind of Court he wants.

The question naturally arises why he did not see and act upon this strategy as soon as Mr. Justice Van Devanter retired and before the final bitterness of the struggle emerged. We do not pretend to know what was in his mind, but one good reason existed. The Senate was unanimous for the appointment of Senator Robinson, and the President could not have ignored the demand for the elevation of the official Democratic leader. But, as we said before his death, Mr. Robinson would in all likelihood not have turned out to be either an able legal scholar or a liberal in constitutional interpretation. After his death, the way is clear for the appointment of someone who will be more likely to be of the caliber of Justices Brandeis, Stone and Cardozo. It is of course difficult to be sure just how any appointee will turn out in the long run, but Mr. Roosevelt will be throwing away the substance of his victory as well as dispensing with its shadow unless he takes great care to pick the best possible appointees.

And what about future progressive legislation? Has the fight against the Court proposal solidified a conservative bloc of Democrats who will, with the Republicans, be able to stand in the way of the President's program? That outcome is barely possible, but we should guess that it will not happen. The Court bill would probably have been defeated by a narrow margin if it had come to a vote, but only through the aid of Senator Wheeler and other Democrats who were loud in their protestations that they stood with the President on every other issue. The acid test will come when new bills have to be voted upon, and when the President makes his appointment or appointments to the Court. If the senatorial prodigals do not come back to the fold on such occasions they will be sacrificing not merely their political integrity but also their political futures. For in spite of the impression carefully created by the press that a majority of the voters were against the President on the Court, it is doubtful whether they really were, and it is certain that they have not turned anti-progressive entirely. If there is to be a division in the Democratic Party and a revolt against Mr. Roosevelt's leadership, he would be stronger on almost any other issue than on that which he has just surrendered.

There remains the possibility that he will himself fail to provide any more progressive leadership, and that the revolt must come from the left. It may be that the Democratic Party simply will not stick together in the face of the kind of issues that now confront the nation. But that is another story, and does not seem likely to be affected by the outcome of the recent conflict.

Finally we must not overlook the really important fact that the President has won the Senate's consent to most of the reforms he proposed for the inferior federal courts. These reforms were highly desirable, and their enactment will be a minor victory that, in other circumstances, might be regarded as major.

Is the Wagner Labor Law Unfair?

FOR MANY months there has been a campaign of attack against the Wagner Labor Relations Act and the National Labor Relations Board, on the ground that they are one-sided and partial to labor. It is desired to amend the Act and either to change the personnel of the Board or to curb its powers. We think it not unfair to say that most of these attacks are inspired by employers hostile to organized labor. In so far as they have been supported by the public, it is because the background and purposes of the Act have not been understood.

The Wagner Act is not a law intended to provide a machinery for mediation or arbitration of industrial disputes. The Labor Board is not an arbitral or a judicial body. There is no intention in the law, and no duty is assigned by it to the Board, to hold the scales even as between employers and labor, in reference to the subject matter that it covers. The Wagner Act makes certain practices illegal; it is like a law forbidding murder or robbery. The Board set up under it is for the purpose of administering and enforcing the law. It is something like a district attorney's office. To say that the law should be amended in order to make it impartial, and that it should be administered impartially, is like saying that the laws against murder or robbery should be so drafted and enforced as to give suspected criminals an even break against the government. This does not mean that either the Board in one case or the district attorney in the other ought to be careless about the facts as to whether the suspect is guilty as charged, or ought to deprive him of his legal rights. But it does mean that in both cases the basic purpose is to prevent people from breaking the law.

What is the nature of the acts forbidden, and what is the purpose of forbidding them? The as-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sumption of the law is that labor has the right to self-organization without interference by employers, and the right to bargain collectively with employers about conditions of employment. It is a public policy to protect this right. Until unions independent of employers exist, and until employers consent to bargain with them, there exists no basic equality as between employers and labor. Unorganized employees, bargaining individually, are at a disadvantage, because of the superior economic resources of the employer. The existence of unions and of collective bargaining with them is the first premise, the *sine qua non* of fair industrial relations. Once this condition is established, then it is possible to go on to mediation, arbitration, or what have you. But as long as employers stand in the way of its establishment, they are denying labor's fundamental rights and are obstructing public policy as declared in the Wagner Act. The sole purpose of the Act and the sole function of the Board is to prevent employers from doing so. An employer who does oppose the existence of unions or collective bargaining has no right to complain if the police powers of the government are exercised against him.

In pursuit of its purpose the Wagner Act outlaws "yellow-dog contracts," employer-controlled or instigated unions, discharge of workers for union membership, the refusal to bargain collectively, and other "unfair labor practices"—all of which experience has taught us the anti-union employer has habitually used to checkmate the successful organization of his employees. And in order to overcome the frequent objection that a majority of his employees do not wish to belong to the union or to bargain through it, the law authorizes the Board to hold elections in which a bargaining agent may be chosen by a majority. The Board is also authorized to delimit the unit to be used for bargaining purposes—that is, to say whether in a given instance it is to be a craft, a whole plant, or a number of plants. Obviously some unit must be chosen, and the guiding principle under the main intent of the law is to make collective bargaining as effective as possible under the particular circumstances. In cases where only one craft or plant is organized, that unit should be allowed to bargain. In other cases the unit may be broader, and should be so for effective bargaining.

Suggested amendments to the law have nothing to do with its main purpose, and would in many cases obstruct the achievement of that purpose. It is suggested, for instance, that rules be established for the policing of strikes—rules which would limit the number of pickets, or define peaceful picketing, or safeguard the right of non-strikers to go to work. But it is not the function of the federal government to police strikes, and it has not the policemen with which to do so. The preservation of order is a duty of state and local agencies. Plenty of local regulations of this sort exist. Furthermore, it would confuse the issue if the main purpose of the law—to decide whether the employer is unfairly opposing union organization and collective bargaining and to make him desist if he is doing so—were obscured by efforts to restrain the action of strikers, who may either be striking against an employer who is himself violating the law, or who may be engaged in a strike which is outside the purview of this act entirely.

It is proposed that no strike be permitted unless a majority of the employees affected vote for it under a Labor Board election. But the calling of strikes is a function of unions, and they customarily do make sure that they have adequate support; otherwise they incur too heavy a risk of defeat. All this is far afield from the purpose of the bill. It is also proposed that the employer be permitted to demand an election by employees to choose a bargaining agency. Why should he? It is none of his business what agency the employees choose or when they choose it. There is no more reason to allow him to ask for an election than to allow him to form unions. If any group of employees want an election they can always request it; if they do not, a request by an employer would raise the suspicion that he was interfering with their affairs in his own interest. It is proposed that the unions be made responsible for execution of contracts. They are as responsible under preëxisting laws as employers are; but anyway you cannot have a responsible union until you have a union, and it is to protect the very existence of unions that the Wagner Act was passed.

The idea that the Act and the Board simply foment strife is not in accord with the facts. Strife arises principally when employers disobey the Act either in letter or in spirit—as in the case of the present steel strike. But against this turmoil involving some 75,000 men must be set the peaceable organizing of several hundred thousand in the rest of the steel industry without strikes, and in many cases with the successful intervention of the Labor Board. We do not hear much about the peaceable settlements. Up to June 30, the Board had dealt with 5,248 cases involving at least 2,000,000 workers. Most of these cases were satisfactorily settled without even a decision by the Board, simply by explanation and application of the law. One in every four of the cases filed was dismissed or withdrawn. One in every two and a half was adjusted to the satisfaction of both parties. Only one in every twenty-seven required a decision by the Board. If an employer thinks the Board has done him an injustice, he can of course appeal to the courts. Comparatively few employers like Tom Girdler prefer industrial warfare in a basic challenge to the law.

Instead of condemning the law and the Board, commentators ought to condemn the combative employers who do not accept the newly declared national policy. They ought to do this, that is, unless they are against unions and collective bargaining altogether. Of course it is always possible to pass supplementary legislation providing for government arbitration of industrial disputes. But it would be folly to do this in a way that would hamper the basic requirement of any fair settlement—the existence and recognition of one party to the controversy.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Right to Work

"THE RIGHT TO WORK" is the slogan the Johnstown, Pennsylvania, Citizens' Committee has adopted as its rallying-cry and, from all present indications, it is a phrase to remember and be wary of, because the Committee appears to be America's most openly fascist organization. It is already much larger than a one-city organization; on July 15 representatives of citizens' groups from twelve states met in convention (and it is fair to assume the movement has since gained some ground) to find a suitable program to "preserve the inalienable constitutional right to work."

In simple language, the Citizens' National Committee is an anti-union vigilante group, thus far composed largely of professional patriots and Red-baiters, with its publicity campaign in the hands of the New York advertising agency of Thornley and Jones (whose chairman is John Price Jones, a professional fund-raiser and a native of Johnstown). Its purpose is to combat the growing power of organized labor through an emotional appeal, based on the standardized tricks of the propagandists.

The campaign appeared publicly for the first time at the end of June, when full-page advertisements, "We Protest," appeared in newspapers all over the country. The protest was against the violence the CIO had caused (so the ad alleged) in the course of the strike against Bethlehem Steel. Three weeks later (July 16) a second ad appeared throughout the nation (see, for example, The New York Times, page 9). This one was called "Common Sense," and it contained the credo of the Citizens' National Committee, a report of the $59,000 success of the first advertisement's appeal for funds, and a few adroit attacks on Governor Earle (for his declaration of martial law that had prevented the opening of the Bethlehem plant), on the National Labor Relations Board and on Senator Robert F. Wagner.

In the statement the Committee said it was "not anti-union and not vigilante," but a few paragraphs later came these resolutions:

> Whereas, certain public officials in high places as well as minor executives of the law throughout the country have failed to use the authority given them as a trust under oath to protect American citizens in their inalienable constitutional rights to work without molestation, and
>
> Whereas, occasions have arisen where we can no longer look to certain constituted authorities to protect human constitutional rights,
>
> Therefore, as loyal American citizens we feel it is our patriotic duty to perfect a nationwide organization whose function it shall be to restore and protect those constitutional rights that have been taken from American citizens by certain unworthy officials. . . .
>
> We believe that labor unions and employers should be equally responsible before the law.

In an interview with members of the Committee, The New York Post published these statements of policy:

> We want every man to work. He should not have to pay dues to somebody who can tell him whether he can work or not. . . . We are not against the right to strike, but we declare that such a right is the individual's, and should not be assumed by some so-called labor leader.

In the face of this evidence, the advertisement's original thesis looks rather forlorn. The Citizens' Committee says it isn't a vigilante group, but it fits to the letter Webster's definition: "a volunteer committee of citizens for the protection of any interest . . . especially when the processes of law appear inadequate." It is not against the union; simply against the functions of the union. But one of the best clues to the nature of the group are the biographical data of some of the leaders who came to New York last week to continue organizing. They are in brief, as published in the daily press:

> Reverend Rembert Smith, founder of the Methodist League against Communism, who filed slander suits in 1931 against two Bishops of his church, was suspended for "gross imprudence and high unministerial conduct" and was later reinstated and transferred to a small pastorate in Oklahoma.
>
> Donald Kirkley, former newspaperman from Texas and an employee of the Ku Klux Klan paper which was converted into The National Farm News.
>
> Ormsby McHarg, engaged in chemical research, was Assistant Secretary of Commerce and Labor under President Taft in 1909. In 1910 Mr. McHarg said that Theodore Roosevelt was "the most dangerous figure in public life in America." In 1914 he was engaged as one of Roosevelt's campaign managers.

These are the ideas and these are the men who are behind "The Right to Work." If, by any chance, their movement does not perish within the next month or so—because of incompetent leadership or the publicity of the NLRB investigation—it is important to remember that its leaders had no interest in the rights to work of the millions who were and still are, for the most part, unemployed. They have no interest in the conditions of work, or in the betterment of those conditions that the unions seek to bring about. They are interested only in the rights of the man who doesn't want to join the union and wants to break the strike.

THE NEW REPUBLIC
PUBLISHED WEEKLY AND COPYRIGHT, 1937, IN THE U. S., BY EDITORIAL PUBLICATIONS, INC., 40 EAST 49TH STREET, NEW YORK.

EDITORS
BRUCE BLIVEN MALCOLM COWLEY R. M. LOVETT
GEORGE SOULE STARK YOUNG

ASSISTANT EDITORS
T. R. CARSKADON OTIS FERGUSON ELIZABETH HULING

TREASURER: DANIEL MEBANE

CONTRIBUTING EDITORS
H. N. BRAILSFORD JOHN T. FLYNN WALDO FRANK
E. G. LINDEMAN W. P. MANGOLD JON. MITCHELL
LEWIS MUMFORD REXFORD G. TUGWELL

RATES: SINGLE COPIES, FIFTEEN CENTS; YEARLY SUBSCRIPTION, FIVE DOLLARS; CANADIAN, FIVE DOLLARS AND FIFTY CENTS; FOREIGN, SIX DOLLARS; THREE MONTHS' TRIAL, ONE DOLLAR.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Soviet China

I: *What the Chinese Communists Want*

Once again, there is the gravest danger of war between Japan and China. While the present crisis may be settled, the threat of conflict in the next few months seems steadily increasing. Perhaps the most important single factor in the Far Eastern situation is Soviet China. Will it unite with Nanking in beating back the Japanese invader? And if so, what part will be played by the USSR, itself so seriously threatened by Japan? Light is thrown on these questions by the series of articles by Edgar Snow, of which the first is published herewith, describing Soviet China, the vast, heavily populated Communist area, to which hardly any Europeans have thus far penetrated, and of which so little has heretofore been written.—THE EDITORS.

WHAT ARE the fundamental policies of the Chinese Reds today? I have had a dozen or more talks on this subject with Mao Tse-tung and other leading Communists. But before we examine these policies it is necessary to have some conception of the nature of the long struggle between the Communists and Nanking. If we are to comprehend even the recent events in the reddening Northwest, which now seems to pose the future of China in terms of the unpleasant international dilemma—"Fascism or Communism?"—we must first look at a few facts of history. In the following paragraphs I paraphrase, in part, the comments of Lo Fu, the young American-educated secretary of the Communist Central Committee, whom I interviewed in Pao An.

As is well known, the Chinese Communist Party began in 1920. It grew very rapidly till 1923, when Dr. Sun Yat-sen, founder of the Kuomintang (Nationalist Party), made his famous entente with Soviet Russia. Neither the Kuomintang nor the Kungchangtang (Communist Party) had power, and both claimed to be struggling to establish democracy. It was easy to reach an understanding. In 1924 the Kuomintang was reorganized, an alliance was formed with the Communist Party, and Communists became very active in leading and organizing the great revolution of 1925-27, which finally overthrew the corrupt Peking dictatorship.

Now the basis of this coöperation, so far as the Communists were concerned, can be summarized as the acceptance by Dr. Sun Yat-sen and the Kuomintang of two basic revolutionary principles. The first recognized the necessity of an anti-imperialist policy—the recovery of complete political, territorial and economic sovereignty, by revolutionary action. The second demanded an internal policy of anti-feudalism—the realization of a democratic revolution against the landlords and warlords, and the construction of new forms of social, economic and political life, which both the Communists and the Kuomintang agreed must be democratic in character.

The Communists, of course, regarded the successful fulfilment of the "bourgeois-democratic" revolution as a necessary preliminary for any socialist society that might later be established, so their position was logical in supporting a "democratic national independence and liberation" movement.

Unfortunately Dr. Sun Yat-sen died before the revolution was completed. Coöperation between the Kuomintang and the Kungchangtang came to an end in 1927. From the Communist point of view, the Nationalist Revolution may also be said to have ended then. The right wing of the Kuomintang, dominated by the new militarism and supported by certain foreign powers, the treaty-port bankers and the landlords, broke away from the legally elected government at Hankow. It formed a regime at Nanking under Chiang Kai-shek which the Communists and the majority of the Kuomintang at that time regarded as "counter-revolutionary," *i. e.*, against the "bourgeois-democratic revolution" itself.

The Kuomintang soon became reconciled with Nanking, but communism became a crime punishable by death. What the Reds conceived to be the two main points of nationalism—the anti-imperialist movement and the democratic revolution—were abandoned. Militarists' civil wars, and later intensive war against the rising agrarian revolution, ensued. Many thousands of Communists, democrats and former peasant union and labor leaders were killed. The unions were suppressed. Democracy was not established, of course, but an "enlightened dictatorship" which made war on all forms of opposition. Even so, quite a number of Communists survived in the army, and the Party held together throughout a period of great terrorism. Today, despite the expenditure of billions of dollars in civil war, the Red armies occupy in the Northwest the biggest single connected territory ever under their control.

Of course the Reds believe that the decade of history since 1927 has richly validated their thesis that national independence and "socialism" (which the Kuomintang also claimed as its objective) cannot be achieved in China without an anti-imperialist policy externally and an agrarian revolution internally. It is not necessary fully to inspect their case. But if we are to see why communism is steadily increasing its following, especially among patriotic youth, and why at the moment it projects upon the screen of history the shadows of great upheaval and

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

change in the Orient, we must note its main contentions. What are they?

First of all, the Reds assert that since Nanking split the living forces of the revolution China has lost much ground. Compromise has followed compromise. The failure to realize agrarian revolution resulted in widespread discontent and open rebellion from the rural population in many parts of the country.

Mao Tse-tung, as secretary of the Peasants' Committee of the Kuomintang in 1926 (before the break with the Communists, when Mao was also on the Central Executive Committee of the Kuomintang), supervised the collection of land statistics for areas in twenty-one provinces. He told me this investigation indicated that resident landlords, rich peasants, officials, absentee landlords and usurers, about 10 percent of the whole rural population, together owned over 70 percent of the arable land in China. About 15 percent was owned by middle peasants. But over 65 percent of the rural population—made up of poor peasants, tenants, etc.—owned only from 10 to 15 percent of the total land.

"These statistics were suppressed after the counter-revolution," Mao told me. "Now, ten years later, it is still impossible to get any statement from Nanking on land distribution in China." This is quite true. On my last visit to Nanking I saw Mr. Chin Fen, secretary of the National Economic Council, and asked him for such figures. He replied that the surveys were "not yet completed."

Every time some new blood is let into the veins of Nanking, the land question arises. I remember talking last spring to Dr. Chiang Ting-fu, just after he had joined the Executive Yuan. He pointed to the tremendous burden of 2,000,000 armed men, in addition to gendarmes, special rural police, militia, *min tuan,* etc., much of which was necessary primarily to protect the landlords. Dr. Chiang thought redistribution of land imperative if Nanking were to get any mass base in the population. He had a scheme for it. He believed it could be accomplished and in fact was necessary if capitalism were to be developed in China. But Dr. Chiang was soon sent off as Ambassador to the USSR and nothing happened.

Rural bankruptcy has been paralleled by the disastrous consequences of the abandonment of anti-imperialism, which to most Chinese today means "anti-Japanism." As a result of Nanking's "no-war policy" against Japan, China has lost to Japanese invaders about a fifth of her national territory, 41 percent of her railway mileage, 85 percent of her unsettled lands, 80 percent of her iron deposits, 37 percent of her finest forest lands and about 40 percent of her national export trade. Japan now controls over 75 percent of the total pig-iron and iron-mining enterprises of China, and over half of the textile industry of China. These are changes which many feel completely wiped out any achievements in reform that Nanking may be able to claim to its credit for generations in the future—even provided the rest of China remains intact.

And what has been achieved by Nanking's nine years of war against the Reds? The Northwest recently summarized these results in a manifesto opposing preparations for the sixth anti-Red "final-annihilation" drive. It reminded us that Manchuria had gone to Japan during one "final-annihilation" drive, Shanghai been invaded during another, Jehol given up during the third, East Hopei lost during still another, and the sovereignty of Hopei and Chahar Provinces badly impaired during the fifth "remnant-bandit extermination." Inevitably, so the Northwest felt, Suiyuan would be lost during Chiang Kai-shek's newest anti-Red drive in the Northwest, which coincided with Japan's invasion of the northern regions of that province. And that is why Chang Hsueh-liang and his bitterly anti-Japanese troops from Manchuria arrested the Generalissimo at Sianfu on December 12 and openly mobilized to bring about a complete change in the foreign and domestic policy.

That is why, also, despite the great strategic advantages which the Red Army enjoys in its developing position today, the "Soviet Central Government," in collaboration with the rest of the Northwest, and with anti-Japanese armies and patriotic associations throughout China, offers to coöperate with Nanking to end civil war. It petitions once more for a "united front" against the aggressor, and offers to submit its Red Army and its Soviet districts to the complete authority of Nanking—*provided* that Nanking agrees to establish democratic repreesntative government, resists Japan, enfranchises the people and guarantees civil liberties to the masses. In other words, the Reds want to return to the original basis of the revolution—anti-imperialism and agrarian relief. As they put it, they want "really to carry out the will of Dr. Sun Yat-sen."

And what is the Reds' formula for unifying China and concentrating the entire energies of China on the struggle for national preservation? Mao Tse-tung reminded me that the present Red demand for cessation of civil war and a common front against Japan was not new, but traces back to 1932. In that year the "Central Soviet Government" in Kiangsi, then claiming to represent nearly ten million people, officially declared war on Japan. It offered to cooperate with any anti-Japanese forces in the country, to unite with Nanking, if given representation, and to begin national resistance against Japan. The reply was another blockade and annihilation drive from Nanking.

Why do the Communists feel more hopeful of a sympathetic response to similar proposals today? Mao Tse-tung explained to me that there were three main reasons for the new offers: First, the steady intensification of Japanese aggression in China, and the broadening realization throughout the nation that the basic question of the independence of the nation is at stake. Second, the development during past years, despite severe suppression, of a great

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

national patriotic anti-Japanese movement, realization by the people that China could not fight Japan so long as civil war continued, and a readiness in many places to accept the Communist proposals for a democratic, representative, anti-Japanese front. And finally because, in Mao's words: "Anti-Japanese elements even in the Nanking government, and Nanking's own armies, are today ready to unite because of the peril to our national existence."

Mao continued:

> The fundamental point of unity which we insist upon is the national-liberation, anti-Japanese principle. In order to realize it we believe there must be established a national-defense democratic republic. Its main tasks must be (1) to resist the foreign invader, (2) to grant popular rights to the masses of the people, and (3) to intensify the development of the country's economy.
>
> Such a program fulfills the will of the people at present, and that is why the Soviet government favors it. . . . We shall support a parliamentary form of representative government, an anti-Japanese national-independence government, a government that protects and supports all popular patriotic groups. If such a republic is established the Chinese Soviets will become a part of it. We will realize in our areas the same measures for democratic government as are realized in the rest of China.
>
> The process in fact has already been completed in Chinese Soviet districts, as representative government exists, from the village up to the province and the central Soviets. Every farmer and worker in Red China has a vote for his village government, and for its delegates to the higher Soviets.

"Does that mean," I asked Mao Tse-tung, "that the laws of such a government would also apply in the Soviet districts?"

He replied in the affirmative, without qualifications. I then asked him whether the Red Army would completely submit to the higher command of Nanking, provided a popularly elected representative government were established to replace the military dictatorship. Mao answered:

> We recognize that in an anti-Japanese war there must be unified command of the national army, but we believe that the war council must be representative. It should be emphasized that this is only possible on the basis of the anti-Japanese national-independence front and democracy. Some Kuomintang members also talk of "unification," but not to support the national-liberation and anti-imperialist movement. In reality it is perfectly clear that without real anti-imperialist struggle there can be no unification of the country.

I asked him whether the people's-front policy meant that the Communist Party was willing to give up, or postpone indefinitely, the confiscation of landlords' land and its redistribution to the peasantry.

"This," he explained, "will have to be decided upon with the development of the anti-Japanese movement. However, we are confident that the anti-Japanese program cannot be realized without relief to the peasantry. Agrarian revolution is of bourgeois character. It is beneficial to capitalism. We are not opposed to the development of capitalism in China now, but against imperialism and Japanese conquest."

In using the word "imperialism," the Communists distinguish between those countries who are actively aggressive and invading China today, and those democratic capitalist powers who are friendly and non-aggressive at present. Mao explained:

> Concerning the question of imperialism in general we observe that among the great powers some express unwillingness to engage in a new world war, some are not ready to see Japan occupy China: countries such as America, Great Britain, France, Holland and Belgium. Then there are countries permanently under the menace of the aggressive powers, such as Siam, the Philippines, Central American countries, Canada, India, Australia, the Dutch Indies, etc.—all more or less under the threat of Japan. We consider them our friends and invite their coöperation. . . .
>
> So except for Japan and those countries which help Japanese imperialism (meaning Italy and Germany, as indicated by Mao elsewhere) the categories mentioned above can be organized into anti-war, anti-aggression, anti-fascist world alliances. In the past Nanking has received much help from America, England and other countries. Most of these funds and supplies have been used in civil war. For every Red soldier killed, Nanking has slain many peasants and workers. According to a recent article by the banker, Chang Nai-ch'i, it has cost the Chinese people about $80,000 for every Red soldier killed by Nanking. Such "help," therefore, does not seem to us to have been rendered to our people.
>
> Only when Nanking determines to cease civil war and to fight against Japanese imperialism, and unites with the people's revolution to organize a democratic national-defense government—only then can such help be of real benefit to the Chinese nation.

I asked Mao whether the Soviets were in favor of canceling unequal treaties. He pointed out, correctly enough, that many of these unequal treaties have in effect already been destroyed by the Japanese, especially in the case of Manchuria. But as for the future attitude of a representative government in China, he declared:

> Those powers which help or do not oppose China in her war of independence and liberation should be invited to enjoy close friendly relations with China. Those powers which actively assist Japan should naturally not be given the same treatment: for example, Germany and Italy, which have already established special relations with Manchukuo, and cannot be regarded as powers friendly to the Chinese people.
>
> When we have won our independence, China will peacefully negotiate with friendly powers treaties of mutual advantage. The Soviet government welcomes foreign capital investment. Legitimate foreign loans will be recognized.

As for domestic policies of the Communists, these are observable in reforms already realized in the Red districts of the Northwest, and in those of the Kiangsi and Fukien soviet districts. Opium traffic, for example, has been entirely suppressed in

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the old Red areas of the Northwest. So have usury (money-lending rates were formerly between 50 and 60 percent), child slavery and prostitution. Child slaves and prostitutes have been given land or work in the factories. Official corruption is severely punished. Whatever else is said against the Reds, few maintain that anybody is getting rich by "squeeze" (graft) in the Soviet districts.

Famines and floods, the Reds believe, are caused primarily by men, and are not acts of God, and both can be prevented or at least alleviated. Unemployment is a problem which, as far as I could see, no longer existed in the Red areas. While it is difficult to walk a block in any busy section of a crowded city in China without being approached by at least one or two beggars, in my travels in Soviet China I did not meet one. Illiteracy is being vigorously attacked in mass-education schools, in the army, through the Soviets, the Communist Party schools, and the clubs and societies under the Young Vanguards, the Young Communists, and the Poor Men's Societies. In Hsing Kuo, the Reds' model *hsien* in Kiangsi, League of Nations investigators took note of the conquest of illiteracy among the youth, achieved by the Reds. In Shensi and Kansu, where illiteracy seems to affect about 95 percent of the population, the Soviet government has drawn up a plan for liquidating adult illiteracy within five years.

Finally I asked, is it possible for China to make anti-imperialist alliances with democratic capitalist powers? Mao replied:

> Anti-imperialist, anti-fascist alliances are in the nature of peace alliances, and for mutual defense against war-making nations. A Chinese anti-fascist pact with capitalist democracies is perfectly possible and desirable. It is to the interest of such countries to join the anti-fascist front in self-defense. . . .
>
> If China becomes completely colonized it will mean the beginning of a long series of terrible and senseless wars. A choice must be made. For itself, the Chinese people will take the road of struggle against its oppressors, and we hope also that the statesmen and people of foreign nations will march with us on this road, and not follow the dark paths laid down by the bloody history of imperialism. . . .
>
> To oppose Japan successfully, China must also seek assistance from other powers. *This does not mean, however, that China is incapable of fighting Japan without foreign help!* The Chinese Communist Party, the Soviet government, the Red Army, and the Chinese people, are ready to unite with any power to shorten the duration of this war. But if none joins us we are determined to carry on alone.

Peiping, China. EDGAR SNOW.

The Court Sees a New Light

AMERICAN constitutional law has first and last undergone a number of revolutions, but none so radical, so swift, so altogether dramatic as that witnessed by the term of Court just ended. I have in mind only the results so far recorded in actual decisions; when the logical possibilities for the future of these holdings are considered, the impression left is, of course, still more striking.

A year ago minimum-wage legislation, even for women, still rested under the ban of the Court, the national government was for the most part without authority over the employer-employee relation in the industrial field, and social security was at best highly suspect on constitutional grounds. Today the truth contradicts each one of these statements. More than that, the *tone* of the Court has altered vastly in a twelvemonth. Last spring, following the slaughter of the AAA and "the little NIRA," the Chief Justice jauntily proclaimed in his American Law Institute address, "I have to announce that the Supreme Court still functions," and at about the same time six of the nine Justices joined in the case of Jones v. the SEC in an opinion which sets an all-time high for judicial arrogance. These lapses from good sense and good taste would not today be repeated.

The Court first gave arresting notice of its change of mind when, on March 29, it sustained a minimum-wage statute of the state of Washington, and at the same time explicitly overruled its decision of 1923 in Adkins v. the Children's Hospital, which it had reaffirmed so recently as June, 1936. The new Court was the outcome of the defection of Mr. Justice Roberts from the Sutherland-VanDevanter-McReynolds-Butler combination, and the Chief Justice was its spokesman. While his opinion cites "the economic conditions which have supervened" since the Adkins case was decided, it also quotes with warm approval the views of the dissenters in that case. "We think," the opinion reads, "that the views thus expressed are sound and that the decision in the Adkins case was a departure from the true application of the principles governing the regulation by the state of employer and employee." But the decision more than recovers lost ground, since much of its reasoning goes to establish the constitutionality of minimum-wage legislation for all workers. Thus the Court pointed out that it was no objection to the act before it that it did not cover the entire field of possible legislation. It also cited the history of hour legislation, which underwent a like expansion. In the Chief Justice's words, "Liberty in each of its phases has its history and connotation. But the liberty safeguarded is liberty in a social organization which requires the protection of law against the evils which menace the health, safety, morals and welfare of the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

people." In the face of these words it becomes impossible to contend that difference in sex sets up an absolute barrier to governmental regulation of wages.

A fortnight later the new Court, again speaking through the Chief Justice, sustained the application of the Wagner National Labor Relations Act to certain industrial establishments which were found to be extensively engaged in interstate commerce. The Act forbids "any unfair labor practice affecting interstate commerce" and lists among these "the denial by employers of the right of their employees to organize and the refusal by employers to accept the procedure of collective bargaining." Dealing first with the "due process" aspect of the case, the Chief Justice characterizes "the right of employees to self-organization and to select representatives of their own choosing for collective bargaining or other mutual protection without restraint or coercion by their employer" as "a fundamental right," interference with which "is a proper subject for condemnation by competent legislative authority." The Chief Justice then continues:

> Long ago we stated the reason for labor organizations. We said that they were organized out of the necessities of the situation; that a single employee was helpless in dealing with an employer; that he was dependent ordinarily on his daily wage for the maintenance of himself and family; and that if the employer refused to pay him the wages that he thought fair, he was nevertheless unable to leave the employ and resist arbitrary and unfair treatment; that union was essential to give laborers opportunity to deal on an equality with their employers.

Thus "liberty" is recognized as something that may be infringed by other forces as well as by those of government; indeed, something that may require the positive intervention of government against those other forces. This recognition marks a development of profound significance in our constitutional history.

But the principal difficulty of these cases arose from the contention of the defendant companies that Congress could not, without unconstitutionally invading the reserved powers of the states, govern the relationship between industrial employers and employees. So, indeed, it had been asserted by the Court itself less than a year previous in the Carter case, in which the Guffey Coal Conservation Act was set aside. Said Mr. Justice Sutherland on that occasion:

> Much stress is put upon the evils which come from the struggle between employers and employees over the matter of wages, working conditions, the right of collective bargaining, etc., and the resulting strikes, curtailment and irregularity of production and effect on prices; and it is insisted that interstate commerce is *greatly* affected thereby. But, in addition to what has just been said, the conclusive answer is that the evils are all local evils over which the federal government has no legislative control. The relation of employer and employee is a local relation. At common law, it is one of the domestic relations. The wages are paid for the doing of local work. Working conditions are obviously local conditions. The employees are not engaged in or about commerce but exclusively in producing a commodity. And the controversies and evils, which it is the object of the act to regulate and minimize, are local controversies and evils affecting local work undertaken to accomplish that local result. Such effect as they may have upon commerce, however extensive it may be, is secondary and indirect. An increase in the greatness of the effect adds to its importance. It does not alter its character.

Furthermore, it is at least highly probable that in speaking thus, Mr. Justice Sutherland voiced what was the opinion of the entire Court at that date. Otherwise the effort of Mr. Justice Cardozo, speaking also for Justices Brandeis and Stone, to separate the price-fixing provisions of the Guffey Act from the hours-and-wages provisions would appear to have been gratuitous, while the Chief Justice's words, in his separate opinion, would be meaningless: "If the people desire to give Congress the power to regulate industries within the states and the relation of employers and employees in those industries, they are at liberty to declare their will in the appropriate manner, but it is not for the Court to amend the Constitution by judicial decision."

Fortunately the Chief Justice was mistaken. If it was a part of the Constitution on May 18, 1936, that Congress could not regulate the employer-employee relation in industry, then the Constitution was in that respect amended by the Court on April 12 last. Setting out from Mr. Chief Justice Taft's dictum in Stafford v. Wallace, decided in 1922, that "whatever amounts to more or less constant practice, and threatens to obstruct or unduly to burden the freedom of interstate commerce, is within the regulatory power of Congress under the commerce clause, and it is primarily for Congress to consider and decide the fact of the danger and meet it," the Court rejects the contention that the power thus recognized has reference only to the protection of the instruments of interstate commerce. "The agency," says the Chief Justice, "is not superior to the commerce which uses it. . . . The close and intimate effect which brings the subject within the reach of federal power may be due to activities in relation to productive industry, although this industry when separately viewed is local." Nor will it do to say that such effect is "indirect." Considering defendant's "far-flung activities," the effect of strife between it and its employees "would be immediate and it might be catastrophic. We are asked to shut our eyes to the plainest facts of our national life and to deal with the question of direct and indirect effects in an intellectual vacuum. . . .

> When industries organize themselves on a national scale, making their relation to interstate commerce the dominant factor in their activities, how can it be maintained that their industrial labor relations constitute a

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

> forbidden field into which Congress may not enter when it is necessary to protect interstate commerce from the paralyzing consequences of industrial war? We have often said that interstate commerce itself is a practical conception. It is equally true that interferences with that commerce must be appraised by a judgment that does not ignore actual experience.

So the test of formula by which the Guffey Act was set aside, a formula derived from the old sugar-trust case of 1895, of evil memory, is replaced by one of fact, and this is speedily shown to be an extremely flexible test. In the Jones-Laughlin case, from the opinion in which the above quotations are taken, the defendant company was the fourth largest producer of steel in the United States, embracing nineteen subsidiaries, owning and operating ore, coal and limestone properties, steamship lines, railroads and manufactories scattered among several states and employing more than a half-million men. But the results reached by the Court in applying the Wagner Act to this immense enterprise were held equally applicable to a manufacturer of trailers located in Detroit but selling more than 80 percent of his products in other states, and to a manufacturer of clothing located in Richmond, Virginia, but selling more than 82 percent of his product in other states.

Let the employees of a concern, a considerable proportion of whose trade and activities extend beyond state lines, be ready and willing to strike resolutely for their "fundamental rights," and Congress can govern the employer-employee relation of such a concern with the purpose and effect of backing up such "fundamental rights"—that is the new constitutional law yielded by the Wagner Act cases, although not all of it. For by the same token Congress should have power also to protect the "fundamental rights" of employers against interruptions that would effect interstate commerce detrimentally. Undoubtedly the protective power of Congress over interstate commerce extends to the employer goose as well as to the employee gander.

Of less interest historically although certainly not practically were the brace of cases in which the new Court sustained, on May 24, the Social Security Act of 1935 as to its substantive provisions, and the companion case in which the Unemployment Compensation Act of Alabama was upheld. Salient features of Mr. Justice Cardozo's opinion for the Court in the former were emphasis on the lessons of the depression of 1929 and of experience with unemployment and old-age relief since then, and the notice taken of the inability of the states to deal separately with the problem of social security, both because of the national scope of the problem and because states compete with one another to attract investors.

Proceeding from this dual basis the Court upholds the power of the national government to tax employers on their employment rolls, such a tax being classified as an "excise"; also its power to spend money in support of unemployment insurance and to provide old-age pensions, expenditures of such nature being for "the general welfare of the United States" within the sense of the taxing clause of the Constitution; also, its power to coöperate with the states in a joint program of unemployment relief and old-age security, and to that end to offer financial inducements to the states to coöperate in such a program.

To the claim that the state of Alabama had been "coerced" by the provision in the act of Congress which accords a 90-percent credit against the federal tax to employers contributing under a satisfactory state law to unemployment compensation, Mr. Justice Cardozo answered: "From all that appears she is satisfied with her choice, and would be sorely disappointed if it were now to be annulled. . . . The petitioners' contention . . . confuses motive with coercion. . . . But to hold that motive or temptation is equivalent to coercion is to plunge the law in endless difficulties." That is to say, there is no constitutional reason why the national government should not supply motives for action by a state. Nor were the terms which Congress had stipulated for a satisfactory state unemployment act an intrusion upon state power, inasmuch as they were designed to protect the National Treasury and were related to activities fairly within the scope of national fiscal power and policy—a test, it may be remarked in passing, which would have saved the AAA.

And Mr. Justice Stone is similarly dexterous in meeting objections to the Alabama Unemployment Compensation Act. Answering the complaint that the tax levied by the Act yielded no benefits to those who paid it, he says: "The only benefit to which the taxpayer is constitutionally entitled is that derived from his enjoyment of the privilege of living in a civilized society, established and safeguarded by the devotion of taxes to a public purpose." And answering the objection that the Act involved an unconstitutional abdication of power by Alabama to the national government, he says:

> The United States and the state of Alabama are not alien governments. They coexist within the same territory. Unemployment within it is their common concern. Together the two statutes now before us embody a coöperative legislative effort by state and national governments, for carrying out a public purpose common to both, which neither could fully achieve without the coöperation of the other. The Constitution does not prohibit such coöperation.

Thus while the keynote of the Wagner Act cases is increased power for the national government over industry and the employer-employee relation therein, that of the Social Security Act cases is national and state coöperation in the field of social insurance. Together these decisions spell a new, a revitalized federal system. To be sure, many questions still remain unanswered—very important questions of statutory interpretation as regards the Wagner Act, several minor questions of

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

constitutionality as regards the Social Security Act. But guaranteed the continuance of the mood which finds expression in the opinions here reviewed, these questions too should find solution satisfactory to the administration.

The question arises, of course, whether the Court's remarkable reversal in attitude, just recorded, is to be set down to the credit of the President's Court proposal. To some extent perhaps, but certainly not altogether. The lesson of the November election could have been lost only on members of the Bench with a messianic complex of some sort; and the CIO "sit-down strikes" must also have had a profound effect in the demonstration which they afforded that the country is not to be governed by the simple expedient of tossing acts of Congress out of the window.

On the other hand, the confirmation which these decisions lend to the major premise of the President's argument for his proposal, of the essentially political nature of the Court's function today in the constitutional field, is impressive. Nor is the contention which is now forthcoming from certain opponents of the idea of reconstituting the Court entirely conclusive. Why, they ask in effect, follow up a successful shotgun wedding by shooting the bridegroom? Why indeed; but what of taking precautions to make it reasonably probable that the bridegroom will now turn to and support the family?

EDWARD S. CORWIN.

Military Lessons from Spain

BECAUSE of the natural fog of war it has always been difficult to gauge the course of a campaign actually in progress, and it has become more difficult with the modern development of censorship and propaganda in creating artificial "smoke." The outline of military events in Spain has now, however, become clear enough to enable the distant observer to estimate the situation and the factors that have governed it. During the fall and most of the winter a state of deadlock prevailed, hardened by the weather. During these months the government forces as a whole remained on the defensive, and succeeded, despite their inferior equipment and training, in frustrating the nationalists' efforts to extend their gains. With each month of continued successful resistance, the government's prospects were the more likely to improve—so long, at any rate, as General Franco did not receive a great increase of assistance from foreign sources. The deadlock was broken by the fall of Malaga, a nationalist coup which was marked by good strategic judgment as well as by Italian backing on a new and important scale. The resistance was slight, its moral stability being easily shaken by the effect of surprise on a state of unpreparedness.

The effort had a significant moral reaction. The government was spurred to change its strategy, and to attempt a widespread series of offensives. These, as was to be expected, made no great material impression, except on the casualty totals. As was also to be expected, the exhaustion of the attackers offered a more promising opportunity for the nationalist forces to renew their offensive. It remained to be seen whether General Franco's forces were capable of exploiting it sufficiently under the conditions of modern warfare. Their most threatening effort was the three-pronged stroke from Siguenza southwestward toward Guadalajara and Madrid, delivered on March 8. While it preserved the assets of surprise and mobility, its promise was high, but these waned all the sooner because of the intervention of General Mud, which gave the resistance time to harden and to be reinforced by General Miaja. Stuck in the mud, the Italians, who largely composed the attacking force, soon became ripe objects for a counterstroke, which came on March 13. Its dramatic success repeated the experience of the World War, where the most striking victories, so long as the forces were fairly well matched, were produced by action of the counter-offensive form. It also showed, as the Ethiopian war had shown previously, that aircraft is specially formidable in such action, and that its advent has greatly enhanced the counter-offensive's power. In Ethiopia the Italians had been the demonstrators of this development; at Guadalajara they served as the body on which the demonstration was performed.

While this is a lesson, now amply attested, to which all those who are concerned with the creation of armies may well pay attention, we should curb the inclination to draw too detailed deductions of general application from particular episodes of the Spanish war. There are signs, for example, of a tendency to treat the Guadalajara offensive as a trial of mechanized forces and an exposure of their defects. Commentators have even described it as the first big battle in which modern "mechanized divisions" have been employed. Yet the narratives show that the bulk of the attacking force was composed of infantry, who were merely carried in trucks and had to dismount before attacking. These would be more precisely described as "motorized" divisions; even so it would appear that most of their vehicles were far from being of a modern kind adequately adapted to movement off the roads. The inability of these temporarily truck-borne infantry to attack effectively after they had dismounted provided a reminder that mud can be a barrier to men on their feet as well as to men on wheels, especially when the barrier is thickened by machine guns.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In weighing the difficulties also met by the accompanying tanks, account should be taken of the fact that the small German and Italian tanks, which have been employed in Spain, were already recognized as too small (and otherwise unsuited) for surmounting serious obstacles. This of course does not imply that larger and better machines would be unaffected by mud if it were sufficiently bad. Twenty years ago Passchendaele taught a lesson in the folly of using tanks in swamplike conditions, if also of pursuing an offensive by any means in such conditions. It is as curious a reflection that these lessons should have been regarded as an adverse revelation on mechanization. Those who have thoroughly studied the subject of mechanized warfare have long insisted on the importance of distinguishing between fully mechanized and merely motorized troops. They have pointed out that, to make the best of the former and diminish the dangers of air attack, the scale of manpower, and consequently of superfluous vehicles, should be much reduced; that the force should be composed of armored vehicles of high cross-country performance; that it should be trained to keep off the roads, to move on wide fronts and to maintain a state of controlled dispersion. Only when these conditions are fulfilled is there any reliable guide to the value of mechanized forces.

Even so, such inferences as can be drawn from symptoms in Spain tend to support the view that the ultimate general effect of mechanization will be toward enhancing the power of defense, through increasing rapidity of reinforcement and countermove, rather than toward reviving the power of the offensive.

The chief threat to the solidity and endurance of modern defense comes from the effect, predominantly moral, of intensive air attack. This has been illustrated in the offensive which the nationalists, baulked elsewhere, have pursued since the spring against the Basque territory in the north. Constant clouds in the mountains at first hindered the use of the mass of Italian and German aircraft which had been concentrated for the purpose, and so long as this friendly cloak remained to compensate the Basques' lack of air defenses they proved able, though only a militia, to hold up the attack of superior ground forces. The experience showed that so long as troops in defense have the spirit to resist, their resistance is likely to prevail even under adverse conditions of training and equipment. A change in the situation came with a temporary improvement of flying conditions, and such progress as the nationalists subsequently achieved coincided with their opportunities to employ their air superiority as a tactical lever, in loosening the defense of key positions which offered a well defined target. Systematic and concentrated air bombardment is hard to endure if there is a lack of direct counter-means, especially where the troops exposed to it know that their resistance on the ground does not suffice to cover their homes, and that their families are suffering a similar bombardment which they can do nothing to check. Air power as exploited against the Basques has revived in a new way the "dual-stretch" of the combatants' instincts which eventually broke down the resistance of the Confederate forces seventy years ago when Sherman made his back-door entry into the South and cut a swath of devastation through Georgia and the Carolinas.

The development of the war in Spain is symptomatic of the general trend of modern warfare. This serves to blow away sentimental vaporings about the heroic virtues of war, utilized by militaristic nations in generating a warlike spirit among their people. It can no longer be claimed that war is, in common sense, any test of a people's fitness. Or even of their national strength. The most virile and most united people would not be able to withstand another, or even a mere party, inferior to it in all natural qualities if the latter had some decisively superior technical appliance. Fighting spirit itself is a factor of diminishing importance. There is even a prospect that a nation as such may be at the mercy of any gang of moral and physical degenerates which becomes possessed of such an appliance—a reflection that lends irony to the fact that nationalism is being so assiduously cultivated at the very time that science is undermining its foundations. There is, however, another and better prospect, that an apparently weak and unmilitary country where scientific research proceeds under the fairest conditions may come on such a means. That possibility, which is becoming more likely, imparts instability to any warlike calculations, and may thus be a deterrent to any power which is inclined to venture on war on the basis of its own calculable military strength.

In general, the experience of the war in Spain has given cause for more encouragement than discouragement to peaceful peoples. While due allowance must be made for the small scale of the air forces engaged there relative to that which a general European war would produce, and for the handicap of inadequate ground organization, it is justifiable to draw two provisional conclusions—first, that air bombing tends to follow the general course of experience with past weapons, and to prove less overwhelming in fulfilment than in anticipation, in practice than in theory; second, that while defense is not yet on equal terms with attack in the air, the deterrent influence of its presence is far more powerful than its actual effect, while the effect attained by the attack decreases disproportionately with the multiplication of defensive means.

On land, the experience of the war has strongly supported the evidence of the World War that the defense is paramount at present. This has added significance because relatively small forces in vast areas offered the attack more scope, and a better chance, than it had on the closely packed Western Front. There have been a few successes gained mainly by maneuver. But offensives by either side have in general had small effect in proportion to their cost of life. And, even when a local moral

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

breakdown has momentarily cleared the attackers' path, experience has again confirmed that of the World War in showing that conditions set a term to their powers of exploiting it. In taking the offensive each side was embarking on a venture whose tactical foundations were unsound, and whose slender chance of any great effect lay in the psychological sphere—in the possibility that the opponents might be ripe for a moral collapse. Otherwise a heavy sacrifice of life with little to show was the probable result. The original circumstances of the campaign, a military revolt against the government, compelled General Franco to adopt an offensive strategy if he was to attain his aims; the extent to which his forces have pursued the offensive tactically would seem to have been more avoidable, and more dangerous to his cause. On the other side the contrasting circumstances of a government without an army helped to produce a wiser tactical course, and this was long maintained. Its abandonment by the government in February may be traced to later circumstances which were too strong for restraining calculation. Raw troops and mass levies are apt to lose morale when kept to the defensive, though it may be well suited to their conditions tactically; even trained forces may falter if thus restrained unless they have carefully taught that the highest art of soldiership lies in utilizing the advantages which firm defense and calculated withdrawal offer for entrapping the opponent. None the less, the side which nowadays pins its hopes on attack courts the risk of undermining its own troops' morale in the effort. That risk has recently developed first on the government side and then on the nationalists'.

General Franco, who started with the advantage in trained troops, could least afford to waste them, as he has done, not merely under pressure of circumstances. Since the autumn of 1936 he has been increasingly dependent on foreign resources, in far greater measure than his opponents. And as the months have passed it has become clear that his chances of military victory depend on the forces poured in by Italy and Germany—and on these being greatly increased. Otherwise the most probable alternative to stalemate is that continued attacks may turn the scales of war against the attacking side. In that event, the collapse of a cause already undermined may be accelerated by complementary attacks on the part of the side which has conserved its strength better. And then, ironically, from the superficial appearance of victorious advances may once again arise the delusion that the attack has found a way of overcoming the defense.

LIDDELL HART.

Birthday Balance Sheet

YESTERDAY was my birthday, and in accordance with long standing custom, I took a few hours off to look at what had happened to the world during my private year, and to cast up accounts on debits and credits.

There were plenty of items for the debit side; in some ways, the past twelve months have been the worst that the world and I have ever had. The Spanish war had a birthday which almost coincided with mine; one hardly needs to recite again the tale of pity and terror that has been told in the Iberian Peninsula in a year. We have seen there a once powerful small minority, of priests, landlords and nobles, threatened by the rising strength of the masses. We have seen them embark on the most traitorous bargain possible, with the fascist dictators of Germany and Italy, a bargain under which they betrayed their own country to these foreigners provided only that some part of their special privileges were restored to them. As a result, we have witnessed twelve months of a war in which civilians have suffered with professional soldiers, a war in which the bombing of Guernica is not exceptional but, so far as the intentions of the fascists are concerned, typical.

We have seen the continuing breakdown of even the pretense of international morality go on until both Hitler and Mussolini frankly admit they are fighting in Spain for what they can get out of it. We have seen Great Britain repeating, substantially, the course she pursued during Mussolini's Ethiopian adventure, little concerned until her own welfare is called in question, and then moving, however cautiously and indirectly, toward the solution that is best for her, no matter what its significance may otherwise be.

In Germany and Italy we have seen, in these twelve months, the sickening process continued of making humorless, savage fascist robots out of human beings. We have had fresh evidence that truth crushed to earth does not always rise again, but may stay crushed, at least for decades, perhaps for generations—provided the crushing is done with the ruthless efficiency now abroad in the world.

In this year, we have seen on the other side of the world a similar grim drama of fascism marching toward its conclusion. The Japanese militarists, who control their country always and do so overwhelmingly most of the time, have gone steadily forward in their plan to take over North China as they conquered Manchuria and, before that, Korea. Their hostility to Soviet Russia is only held in check by their fear of her armed strength. They would go to war tomorrow if they thought it a good gamble; they very nearly did this a fortnight ago, and for just that reason.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

For people like me, nothing in the past twelve months has been more disturbing than those developments in Soviet Russia which caused Japan to consider immediate war. Whatever interpretation one puts upon the numerous trials and executions in the USSR, what has happened there has altered and worsened the view of that country as being what Edmund Wilson called it, "the moral top of the world, where the light never really goes out."

Here at home, the twelve months just ended have brought some things one dislikes to remember. Never in my recollection have the forces of blind reaction been more united or more grimly determined. The presidential election of last autumn marked a low point not equaled for many years, in vituperation of opponents, in open efforts to buy a favorable result, in mean-spirited attempts to safeguard personal property rights without even a fleeting interest in the welfare of the country as a whole. Since then, the hysterical rage of the tories has risen even higher—something I should have thought hardly possible. In various labor troubles throughout the country, company gangsters and municipal police have played their old role. Strikers and their friends have been clubbed, gassed, imprisoned. At least seventeen men have been shot dead in the past few weeks. Murder on this scale is perhaps not very surprising; but I, at least, am innocent enough to be startled that hardly any expression of regret for these deaths comes from anyone except "labor sympathizers." We have come a long way in this country when self-styled liberal editors, writers and public figures by their silence give tacit approval to murder used as a weapon against men who are seeking only the right to organize on behalf of their jobs, on behalf of a living wage for themselves and their families.

The forces of reaction have rallied as never before in my memory, to oppose Mr. Roosevelt's plan for reorganizing the Supreme Court. After the tories have been saying for years that he is a dictator, it now turns out that he is not yet a dictator but would become one if Supreme Court Justices were put under pressure to retire at the age of seventy or seventy-five. Although those who have spent such vast quantities of money, so many days and nights of their time in the effort to block the President's proposal kept up the pretense that they were seeking to preserve the Constitution, I think it is pretty clear that what they want is to preserve—or restore—the conservative majority on the Court as it existed a few months ago. They want a Court dominated by a group of special pleaders for special privilege, men who care nothing for the fate of two-thirds of the population if only they can protect the stranglehold on America's resources that is maintained by three or five or ten percent. No issue has ever been plainer in our history than the fight between Property and People now raging in these United States, with its outcome still in doubt. No battle was ever more foully conducted than that of the protagonists of Property, with their almost complete control of every agency for the creation of public opinion. Nothing was ever more evident than that the Democratic Party as at present constituted is not capable of conducting the struggle on behalf of the People and does not want to.

The credit side of the ledger can be recited in somewhat less space. During this year, as the fascists have advanced, the democratic countries have shown an increasing appreciation of their heritage and a determination to cling to it. The people of Spain have defended themselves heroically and with a good chance of final success. Part of the bitterness of the tory rebellion in the United States has come just because labor is on the march, rejoicing in its new-found strength and solidarity. The movement for industrial unionism represented in the CIO is on the whole the most encouraging single development in American labor history. Despite the dirtiness of the Republican campaign last fall, Mr. Roosevelt was reëlected by about 11,000,000 majority. Although the specific proposal for reorganization of the Supreme Court seems to have been defeated, the Court itself has taken a new line markedly different from the old one and I strongly doubt that we shall again in this generation see its majority tell the people (as Marie Antoinette is supposed to have done but didn't), "Let them eat cake." We have had many dark hours, this past twelve months; but they are not necessarily the dark hours at the beginning of night. They may herald the dawn.

BRUCE BLIVEN.

Daniel

As a matter of record, let it go down,
Let it be said that I have lived
To regret at most but at least to question
My wisdom where the monsters breathed.

Although in darkness mine was faith
To keep those tawny lions stilled,
Lapping against me was their breath
Of flame. The flesh was chilled.

Perhaps in truth I was heroical,
But as time wears on, I am inclined
To believe I was but stoical,
A creature with a stubborn mind.

As time wears on in the lion-peopled
World of darkness where I waken,
That willful faith which so enchanted
Monsters, is most strangely shaken.

For whatever is said of the other side,
And doubtless much will be said of it,
They were the wiser ones who died,
Seeing no visions in the pit.

MARGUERITE YOUNG.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Washington Notes

What Difference Will the Democrats' Split Make? —A Step toward a Realignment of Parties— Congressional Stupidity on Writers' Project

WHETHER the long expected split in the Democratic Party has now taken place is a question something like how old is Ann. The Wheeler-Burke oppositionists have not yet opened separate party headquarters, or attempted to set up a rival Democratic National Committee. On the other hand, about thirty party members in the Senate have repudiated Mr. Roosevelt as their rightful leader, and some of them would deny that he is properly a Democrat at all.

The Democratic Party looks to be headed straight for trouble, but, when you begin to inquire exactly what this trouble will be, you run into all sorts of perplexities. As this department has repeatedly pointed out, the fight over the Supreme Court bill, during its last two months, was as empty of substance as a schoolmen's dispute of the Middle Ages. By May, Mr. Roosevelt had gained one Court appointment, to fill Mr. Van Devanter's place, had gained the half-promise of another, and had gathered in a long string of favorable Court decisions. The reactionaries cannot take these victories from him.

Where else can you foresee trouble? Mr. Roosevelt now has five major bills before Congress: wages-and-hours, the plan for seven regional TVA's, governmental reorganization, control of agriculture and low-cost housing. The Senate conservatives dare not make a frontal attack on any of these. The country is plainly in favor of them, and the conservatives know it. They will fight, but only in the dark. Especially is this true of the wages-and-hours bill. It has already been crippled in committee, and they will try to smother it by forcing a quick adjournment, but there have been, and will be, no speeches about the Founding Fathers, past Democratic platforms or the supposed intentions of God.

There remains Mr. Roosevelt's often announced purpose of raising up the lowest third of the population. How far and fast will he try to go toward this goal? If his purpose is actually to expand production in this country sufficiently to provide the lowest third with a decent standard of living, he is necessarily proposing heroic measures—measures that will bring the Senate reactionaries out on the run, dragging their howitzers, minnenwerfers and gas guns behind them. As far as can be discovered, however, no measures of this character have yet been discussed concretely with the pro-Roosevelt group in Congress, or even drafted. There is no place for them on the next twelve months' legislative program. Mr. Roosevelt is not expected to call a special session for this fall, although this is still undecided. With the session opening next January, he will be almost compelled to bring in his often dodged tax bill. Next year's session will immediately precede the 1938 mid-term elections; for the sake of the Western and Southern Congressmen, he must also bring in, and pass, a farm bill. Congressmen will be eager for adjournment in order to start their campaigns, and once taxes and farm legislation have been disposed of, the chance for serious consideration of a broad, new social program will be scant. So will the chance of a head-on collision between the factions of the Democratic Party.

The Democrats are now badly split, worse split than over the Klan in 1924, perhaps worse than over gold in 1896. But what practical difference will it make, at least within the next few months? This much can be said: that nothing is now in sight at all likely to bring about another open repudiation of Mr. Roosevelt's leadership. Against this, however, must be set the fact that if Mr. Roosevelt means to extend and deepen the New Deal within the limit of his second term, he has powerful motives for putting forward his program before the 1938 elections. There is no likelihood of peace between him and the Senate reactionaries. During the Court debate, Mr. Wheeler said that his "heart bled for Mr. Roosevelt," but each word was spongy with poison. Enemies are within Mr. Roosevelt's house, and the only way he can eject them is to make his political and economic objectives, and his own personality, the issue in next year's Democratic primaries. There is a chance of defeating about a half-dozen of the Senate oppositionists next year, and if they go down the rest will be reduced to the size of the dwarf cadavers prepared by the Indians of Peru. He will not be able to use the Supreme Court issue, however. Next winter, he will presumably have at least four friendly Justices on the Court, and if Mr. Chief Justice Hughes—after his preternaturally sly and successful maneuvers this year—permits the Court to hand down a decision that can be carried into the election, a lot of us have been misjudging him.

Washington has been filled with alarms about history-making decisions being taken by the industrialists and corporation lawyers who form the leadership, and a good part of the rank and file, of the Republican Party. In brief, the plan seems to be that the Republicans will close up shop, and unite with the Wheeler-Burke faction of the Democratic Party. It appears likely that Mr. Al Smith, who has now attained the dignity of a Republican elder, has had a finger in this scheme, and that his recent attempt to obtain both the Tammany and Republican mayoralty nominations for Senator Copeland against the New Deal Mr. LaGuardia in New York was merely a first step toward what is intended to be a fundamental realignment of parties. This plan has a fine, logical sound; one party for conservatives and one for liberals, and all future elections fought on basic economic and social issues. Unhappily, however, the Republican Party, at the moment, does not seem to have a trade-in value. One reactionary Democratic Senator, who faces a stiff primary fight next year, is reported to have sent word to the Republican leaders: "I'll have a hard enough time beating Roosevelt as it is; if the Republican Party of my state endorses me, I'm sunk." Most of the Democratic reactionaries would like whatever Republican votes they can get in secret, but they won't want anything said about it.

Next month, a well known Boston publishing house will issue six volumes of the American Guide, one for each of the New England states, the work of the WPA Writers' Project. They are big, handsome books, filled with a staggering amount of information, and will appear in book-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

shops about the time the Writers' Project finishes firing 1,000 of its 4,200 workers. Apart from the bitter hardship caused by these dismissals, it seems to me they call into question the country's good sense. One of the great industries of New England is its summer tourist trade, and these books form the most persuasive kind of advertising imaginable. Baedeker is the foundation rock on which the medium-income tourist industry of Europe is built. American hotel proprietors are now being given an even more thorough and elaborate work than Baedeker. Yet Congress has decided the Writers' Project is an extravagance we cannot afford. Either Congress is weak in the head, or I am.

Washington. T. R. B.

Other People's Money

Watch the Ford Myths Go By—The Pious Art of Mayhem—So Smash the Tin Lizzie

ONE OF our beloved myths is Henry Ford. He comes at times to be a sort of touchstone by which proposed legislation is tested. If a tax or a regulation or a policy can be shown to be something that might affect Henry Ford it must be bad. If you enact such a law, what will become of Henry Ford? The mere mention of the horrendous possibility that something might happen to Henry Ford is enough to damn any measure.

The basis of this childlike terror is that if there had been no Henry Ford there would be no automobile era, just as there would have been no American electricity era had there been no Samuel Insull. There is also the other simple assumption that the making of cheap automobiles is entirely the product of the Ford brain and that if Ford stopped, the industry would stop. Of course if Ford's labor stops the industry also stops. As a matter of fact, it is not generally perceived how little any one man contributes to such an industry. For the Ford industry needs, not merely labor and a manager, but the accumulated contributions of science in a thousand ways—power, machines, all the many features of the motor car itself, invented by a hundred different men. Among all these things the industry needs a manager. But apparently the manager must be able to take off for his share countless millions as well as the right to shape the social views of his employees and his communities.

But among the ingredients of the Ford myth is this legend—that he is a gentle lover of humanity and that he is the very soul of law and order and civilization in its finest flower. The events of the last few months demonstrate over again a theory I have always entertained: that there is in society no section so given to violence as the conservative, property-loving section. Have you not heard some gentle wisp of an old lady, a model of piety and patriotism, explode into what she would do to the John L. Lewises and similar enemies of society if she had her way?

This is what you have been observing in Dearborn at the plant of this model of evangelical piety and early American love for order. The story of the attack upon the workers at the Ford plant is almost beyond belief. Unfortunately the story, to be understood by the average reader, must be pieced together from the daily accounts over several weeks in newspapers of the NLRB hearings. I rely upon The New York Times for the story.

Walter Reuther, Ford die maker, president of the union's West Side local, and Richard T. Frankensteen, in charge of the union drive among Ford employees, appeared on the Ford overpass to distribute handbills. At the entrance to the plant were about 150 men apparently loitering. A group of these loiterers surrounded the two union men and told them to get the hell off the overpass as it was private property. But before they could do this, Reuther was slugged from behind, thrown to the ground and, while one man gave the orders, others beat and kicked him and then threw him down the iron steps.

Who were these loiterers? Reporters for the Detroit newspapers identified some of them. Arnold Freeman, staff photographer for The Detroit Times, visited the River Rouge plant two days before the riot. He recognized men known in Detroit as "dago hoodlums"—a police-court term. One he knew to be a gentleman who had been involved in a recent hold-up case. Freeman asked him if he was up to his old tricks as a muscle man. He answered that he had been hired to take care of these pamphlet-distributing union men. Freeman asked him if he had the down-river gang with him and he said "yes" and pointed out the chief. Freeman recognized him—Angelo Caruso, for whom a felony warrant is extant. One woman testified that when she attempted to distribute leaflets one of the Ford gangsters grabbed her arms, twisted them and wrenched the leaflets from her hands. Let us trust that our good American, Mr. Ford, was duly horrified at the Japanese sentries who are supposed to have shoved and kicked the American girls in Peiping last week.

Ford employees testified:

That plants swarmed with "service" men, some of them plainly armed;

That there was a rule against talking to fellow workers in the plant so drastic that one workman who merely chatted with a companion nearby was dismissed promptly by service men, but was saved by his foreman;

That men who joined the union were promptly dismissed; that foremen at the Ford plant supervised distribution of applications of blanks for the Ford Brotherhood of America and ordered employees to sign "if you know what is good for you."

That employees were encouraged to set upon and drive out of the plant men who were known to be engaged in union activities;

That after the riot Harry H. Bennett, personnel director of the Ford Company, was heard to compliment service men on their good work.

This is the same Henry Ford who only fifteen years ago was financing and pushing a drive against the Jews. Now his drive is against the rights of workers to organize. And all the time he poses as the soul of true Americanism. Workers of America should remember that Henry Ford makes automobiles and that he needs customers for them.

I do not mind saying this: that I have rendered at least one small verdict on this man for myself. I own a Ford car. I can tell the world that I will never own another.

JOHN T. FLYNN.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Burlesque Needs

MR. JOHN ANDERSON of The New York Evening Journal has been saying I should write down at least a note on the old Weber and Fields burlesque I tell him I used to see. Not only because its passing is something to mourn about forever in our theatre; we should, he says, do everything possible to bring that sort of burlesque into life again for Broadway's sake. Mr. Anderson is a man of astuteness in Broadway theatre affairs, and so I will take his advice a little and repeat some of the things we talked of.

I had come up from the provinces to college, and among my studies was the drama course under Brander Matthews. Those days we were propelled into the serious drama of Ibsen and Pinero, Maeterlinck, Sudermann and others, and we took them seriously; though I think Professor Matthews, being a gentleman who knew the world and seemed to us to have talked in the flesh to countless live actors, had his tongue in his cheek oftener than not. He had in his pocket all the tricks of Scribe and Sardou and other Parisians, and he was not quite sure when a play like "The Doll's House" was merely that same bag of tricks larded up with moral trimmings. He knew that "The Second Mrs. Tanqueray" was Ibsen remarketed, with less depth and more show. At that time, too, the dramas of Clyde Fitch were still applauded and were taken as promising Americana.

Professor Matthews used to speak of Weber and Fields as the American Aristophanes. Allowing, he said, for the differences in poetry and profound application, they were the social satirists of the day and its theatre, and we, of course, saw the point readily enough.

It happened that the season had given us Fitch's play of "The Girl and the Judge," a story of a fine young woman whose parents were rather a handicap, her father being a drunkard and her mother a kleptomaniac, their fortune depleted. The love story was clear from the title. Mrs. Gilbert was in it, and Annie Russell and other noted players; and the strongest scene took place in a room credited to Unit—perhaps that was a double *t*—and contrived with such ingenuity and blaze of cretonnes that anything you opened turned out to hold something else and everything could at any moment be converted to household uses. Beds, clothes presses, toilet accessories were all about you, though invisible; and this showed how the right sort of people are always distinguished no matter what and can totally deceive us with ingenuity and an air of grace. In the burlesque the father drank ink, even in the courtroom snatching up the bottle if the judge should turn his eyes away; and presently the mother, after gazing well at it, snatched the curly front off the judge's mother's head and stuffed it in her bag. After that the daughter, who was Fay Templeton, had all the more to tighten her belt and go on with her mother's salvation. That cretonne apartment was in green with lobsters for the design, and when the furnishings were opened astonishing uses for them were apparent. Unit's clever bed that folded completely from sight proved now to have been a refrigerator; as mother and daughter wrestled with their anguish together, a cold chicken turned up among the covers, and the condition of the pillow let loose a feather or so, then more, then all, fought off by the mother till she was lost in a cloud of them. Fields was the mother, and bracing himself across the bedstead said that she was at last comfortable; and so she and Fay Templeton sang an "Ave Maria." I forget the words but it seemed hilarious when on a high note you heard Hold It Mother. Finally out of the burlesque an end came just as seriously happy as in the drama it mocked, so that all was well.

The same season gave Broadway Belasco's "Du Barry," and for thousands of people it was perfectly *bona fide* theatre art. As a matter of fact, for all its promoted expense and extravagance, it was better than most of what we find now. People went to see the luxury and Du Barry's own bed and Mrs. Leslie Carter, who was by repute another Bernhardt for seduction and raging—Belasco was said to have stuck pins in her during rehearsals—and who smashed candlesticks into the mirror like Bernhardt in "L'Aiglon." Weber and Fields' version can be imagined: the ladies in waiting had dollar marks on their cheeks, the money of the French people was brought in coal scuttles for the king's mistress to squander, and Fay Templeton, reclining there, would say, "This bed cost $90,000, if you don't believe it look in the program." Joe Weber got himself backed against a revolving door and kept coming in and out, talking steadily.

The Weber and Fields versions kept an eye out too, in properties and in scenery, for all pretension, solemnity, heralded innovation, flights of fancy, and so on.

To these burlesques of the plays as much brains were often brought as to the originals and sometimes more, not to speak of the pure theatre of the freedom that was gained from the raillery and license, and the dancing spring and variety implicit in the very approach. The actors were as good as those whom they travestied—very few actors anywhere have had the genius of Fay Templeton—and there was a larger number of good actors in this company than in any other company in town. Playing together so much, and under such a direct and lively pressure from their audiences, they attained to an ensemble playing that Broadway has now long forgotten. The audiences were of every sort, some there rather to see the choruses and dancing, or for the vaudeville moments, some for the burlesque of a current play. The temper of the house and the whole atmosphere was unadulterated theatre; there was a certain virility, health and ironic jollity. The alphabet cackled, the belly shook, the spirit skipped.

And now, as Mr. John Anderson says, look what burlesque has dropped to, strip-teasing and dull bawdy or flat dullness, wherever, that is, there is any burlesque show at all. His point seems to be that if we had a good burlesque —even if it were far down on Fourteenth Street—that would keep Broadway scared to death, it would be a great thing, and might help save matters. I am afraid I end these reflections with one much gloomier, and less exhilarating, than this that evidently gives him a twinge of savage delight. An epoch's theatre that did not produce some burlesque, more or less significant, of itself might fail to do so for one of two reasons. Its theatre might, for the moment, be so grand and high, so passionately bound to its life and idea, as to lack a sense of humor or tolerance for rollicking and pungent distortion or levity in tone. Or its theatre may be so shallow or commercial or soft or feminine—in the old-fashioned uncomplimentary sense of the word—and so little a part of life, and the public so apart from the theatre, that there is no fun making fun of it.

STARK YOUNG.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Bandwagon

Mass production is craftsmanship with the drudgery taken out of it.—*Henry Ford, writing in The Ford News.*

The magnificent Temple of Humanity was sold under the auctioneer's hammer today to furnish scrap iron for warships of Japan's increasing navy.—*From an Associated Press dispatch from Osaka, Japan, published in The New York Times.*

Come on down to Cape Cod for a real vacation where the CIO is unknown and over 90 percent are Republicans who respect the Supreme Court.—*From an advertisement in The Boston Traveler.*

Once again the international uproar, nowadays apparently inseparable from "civilization," is happily punctuated by a sporting event. Tennis at Wimbledon! How nicely our ordered sporting and social occasions relieve the tedious disorders of foreign affairs.—*The Daily Mirror, London.*

Gas masks are being provided for the race horses at Newmarket, because this track was directly on the path of attacking aircraft in the last war, so that a race horse, Mardi Gras, was killed there in 1916.—*News item distributed by the Nofrontier News Service.*

All-time records of the Cook County marriage-license bureau were broken yesterday when 793 couples took out licenses in a last week-end rush before the state venereal-test law goes into effect.—*From a news item in The Chicago Tribune.*

LOOKS LIKE EVERY FAN WILL BE NEEDED

"The Fall of a Woman" will be the subject for Sunday evening at the First Baptist Church. This subject is very appropriate for Independence Day. Real facts and truths will be revealed. There will be plenty of seats as the students will be away. The eleven fans have been reconditioned and they help to cool the building.—*News item in The Daily Commerce (Tex.) Journal.*

IT'S SMART TO BE THRIFTY

The strikers have not yet been in want. They were paid Saturday for a full week's work, and today received checks for their work during the last three days last week. These checks will average $5.40 each, enough to maintain a striker for some time.—*News article in The Baltimore Sun referring to a strike of cannery workers at Cambridge, Md.*

MAN WANTS BUT LITTLE HERE BELOW

Known as a dreamer and philosopher, Eugene is also known as the only duPont satisfied with twenty million dollars.—*From an article by Helen Worden in The New York World-Telegram.*

LIVE ALONE AND LIKE IT

You're all set for summer in a "Nemo-let" the new foundation sensation. It's a garterless girdle, a legless pantie. . . . A determined mite of rubber snuggles against your thigh and holds—tenderly, yet tenaciously, comfortably, yet unmistakably. . . . It's the cutest, coolest girdle that ever hugged your hips.—*Advertisement of Roos Bros. in The San Francisco Chronicle.*

Our readers are invited to contribute to this column and $1 will be paid for each item used. Address The Bandwagon, care of The New Republic.—THE EDITORS.

CORRESPONDENCE

The Letters of Lenin

SIR: Reviewing "The Letters of Lenin" (translated and edited by Doris Mudie and Elizabeth Hill) in your issue of June 9, 1937, Professor Frederick L. Schuman saw fit to refer to the "honesty and accuracy" of the editors and to venture the assurance that "their work rings true and will probably stand up well under the test of time and textual criticism." I am not here concerned with the stupid and utterly factional manner in which material was selected for inclusion; here I want to say a few words of "textual criticism" so as to indicate the unbelieveably careless and downright ignorant way in which the letters have been translated and edited.

It is plain that, whatever their knowledge of the Russian tongue may be, neither of the two editors has the slightest acquaintance with the subject matter of Lenin's letters—the international socialist movement, its institutions and personages. This can best be seen from the way in which they transliterate widely known names from the Russian—they do so phonetically without manifesting any acquaintance at all with the actual names of these people. A few examples will illustrate what I mean:

On page 97, they write G. Longue for J. (Jean) Longuet.
On the same page, B. Liebknecht for W. (Wilhelm) Liebknecht.
On page 259, F. A. Rotstein for Theodore Rothstein. (Theodore is Fydor in Russian.)
On page 324, Kagan for Abraham Cahan, editor of The Jewish Daily Forward.
On page 333, Greilich for Greulich.
On page 342, Trul'stra for Troelstra.
On the same page, Horter for Gorter.
On the same page, Pannekuk for Pannekök.
On page 342, Hëglund for Höglund.
On page 345, Hyde for Guesde. (This is indeed a miracle!)
On page 368, Züdekum for Südekum.
On page 371, Scheiderman for Scheidemann.
On page 374, Nain for Naine.
On page 381, Hilkvit for Hillquit, the well known American Socialist.
On page 398, Samba for Sembat.
On the same page, Legin for Legien.
On page 400, Stürg for Sturgkh.
On page 432, Stawning for Stäuning.
On page 461, Tseller for Zeller.

To illustrate the general ignorance the editors exhibit of their subject matter, it is only necessary to call attention to their astounding definition of the Economists, actually reformistic syndicalists of a sort, as "the Trade Unionist wing of Russian Marxists" (p. 18). I may mention also that on page 467 and elsewhere we meet the absurd and misleading term, "Council of National Commissars," although on page 459 it is correctly given as "Council of People's Commissars." Besides this, such blunders in translation as "professional periodicals" (p. 254) for "trade-union

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

periodicals" or party "Soviet" (p. 184) for party "council" pale into insignificance.

For the last, I reserve two absolutely hair-raising specimens. On page 246, we find a letter dated "Stirsudden, June-July, 1917," in which Lenin declares that he is "against the boycott of the Third Duma," which subject he says he is "going to develop in print." Now, in June-July, 1917, the Third Duma was long a thing of the past and Lenin was certainly not thinking of discussing any policy in connection with it. The mystery is solved by simply correcting the date line to "June-July, *1907*." By turning to page 247, Letter 145, it can be seen that Lenin did, indeed, spend parts of June and July taking a rest at Stirsudden, whence this letter is dated; at that time, the question of boycotting the Third Duma was being vigorously discussed in Russian social-democratic circles. That this is no mere typographical error can be seen from the fact that the alleged 1917, but really 1907, letter is placed among the other 1917 letters and given a consecutive number with them.

On page 228, in the editorial "summary" preceding the new section, we are informed that:

> Oct. 13-Dec. 3: . . . Formation of Executive Committee of the Social Revolutionary Democrats. The SRD paper Izvestia is published.

And, on page *229*, this bit of information is added: "Trotsky at head of SRD."

Now, anyone who knows anything at all about Russian revolutionary history, knows that there never was any such monstrosity as "Social Revolutionary Democrats" and that Trotsky was certainly not at the head of it. What is the key to this curious mystery? The Izvestia was published by, and Trotsky was at the head of, the Soviet of Workers' Deputies. In Russia, the initial letters of the mythical "Social Revolutionary Democrats" and the very real "Soviet of Workers' Deputies" are the same. Evidently the editors met these strange letters in the Russian original but, knowing nothing at all of the subject matter of the work they were translating and "editing," not even enough to know that Trotsky was at the head of the Petersburg Soviet, they very ingeniously *invented* "Social Revolutionary Democrats" to meet the emergency!

New York City. WILL HERBERG.

Kaufman and the Movies

SIR: In Edmund Wilson's long indictment of Hollywood and its writers I am the only Hollywood writer who gets named, barring a passing reference to Maeterlinck. In my entire life I have spent something like three months working for the movies; I did not write "A Day at the Races," with which Mr. Wilson so gleefully credits me, and it is untrue that I "went back for more" after "Once in a Lifetime," because up to that time I had never even seen the place, and neither had Moss Hart. And I see no reason why I should blandly remain silent because Mr. Wilson is too lazy or too indifferent to look up his facts.

Holicong, Pa., not Hollywood. GEORGE S. KAUFMAN.

America and Another War

SIR: Your editorial upon my communication of June 30 "Will America Stop Another War?" convicts me of excessive simplicity. I ought to have made it clear that in asking America to pledge herself to help the democratic nations of Europe against "aggression" I had no intention of getting America to surrender her right to decide whether any particular act of force were an act of "aggression" which should bring her in. No such surrender of judgment would be required in order that her pledges would be effective in preventing an aggressive war.

Of course my assumption is that Britain, France and Russia are "satisfied" nations with no aggressive interests or designs, while Germany, Italy and Japan are "unsatisfied" nations with aggressive policies which they admit and practise. This does not signify any moral superiority for the "satisfied" groups, whose past history convicts them of aggressive actions, but merely indicates the present sources of danger to world peace. I do not admit that my proposal, as thus interpreted, would involve "the possibility of [America's] being engaged in another world war." No "crisis" or "incident" would do more than threaten such a war. That war could not take place if the array of superior strength upon one side were so evident as would be the case with America upon that side.

America's entanglement in another world war is much more possible, and even probable, if she refuses thus to use her potential strength, and finds herself threatened by some aggressive action of Japan or some inflammatory incident involving the lives of her sailors or passengers upon the ocean.

London, Eng. J. A. HOBSON.

Adventure in Spain

SIR: In order to make it possible for qualified persons to study the Spanish situation at first hand a trip has been arranged by The Open Road in consultation with Spanish government authorities and the North American Committee to Aid Spanish Democracy. Fifteen carefully selected persons will be admitted to the group, and arrangements are being made in Spain for a genuine study of the social and political as well as the military situation there. It is just as important to understand Spain as it is to sympathize with it, and I believe that a few of your readers may be personally interested in this unusual venture. The group will sail on the "Queen Mary" on August 11 and return on the "Aquitania" arriving on September 14. Information about the trip may be obtained from its leader, Dr. Herman F. Reissig, executive secretary of the North American Committee, 381 Fourth Avenue, New York City.

New York City. ROGER BALDWIN.

From The New Republic Mail Bag

John J. Ludington, Milwaukee, Wisconsin, writes to call attention to the confiscation by the police of James Farrell's "A World I Never Made" from the Milwaukee public libraries. He says "the general tone, and in many instances the actual policy, of the Milwaukee Public Library is formed by the strong local Catholic element . . . which has come to dominate Milwaukee's life as a city."

Joe Gould, recently engaged in tracking down early Americana for the Writers' Project in New York, tells us he has got so mad at the haphazard dealing out of pink slips that he is holding a meeting at the Vanguard, 178 Seventh Avenue, at 10 P.M., July 29, to protest (not his own firing, about which he thinks nothing can be done) the harm to writers and their project in general. He would like anyone else interested in the same objectives to take part.

Franklin B. Porter of Brooklyn believes that Bruce Bliven, in his article "The Cassandra Racket" [July 14], makes a slight mistake in taking the columnists he mentions too much at their face value. He says, "for the purpose of lessening the influence of these Tories and in order to combat them more effectively let us recognize them for what they are and call a spade a spade."

Robert Pyro of Allentown, Pennsylvania, disagrees violently with John Chamberlain's evaluation of Burton Rascoe's "Before I Forget" [June 30], which Pyro regards as "shabby, slapstick work" written by one whose "brio consists largely of breeziness, literary legerdemain and self-salesmanship."

What's on the Air?

Secretary of Labor Frances Perkins describes the work of her department on another program in the "United States Cabinet" series. Friday, July 30, 10:30 P.M., CBS.

President Roosevelt, President Albert Lebrun, Marshal Petain, General John J. Pershing and Ambassador William C. Bullitt speak at the formal dedication of the Montfaucon monument commemorating the Meuse-Argonne offensive in the World War. Sunday, August 1, 10 A.M., NBC-Blue Network.

Musical and dramatic programs of the week include broadcasts of a program of Gregorian chants by summer students at the Cincinnati Conservatory of Music, Thursday, July 29, 3:30 P.M., CBS; "Cavalleria Rusticana" by the Cincinnati Summer Opera Association, Saturday, July 31, 10 P.M., NBC-Blue Network; and Helen Hayes in Eugene O'Neill's "Beyond the Horizon," Monday, August 2, 2:04 P.M., NBC-Red Network.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

BOOKS IN REVIEW

Taking the Marxist Dialectic Apart

LET ME say at the outset that I regard these three books by Sidney Hook[1]—to which must be added his essay on "Dialectic and Nature" in the April-June number of The Marxist Quarterly—as the most valuable exposition of Marx and Engels which has yet been written in English. If anybody wants a lucid guide to what Marx and Engels really thought as distinguished from what the various Marxist parties think they ought to have thought, Sidney Hook is the man for him to read. I do not always agree with the emphasis of his interpretation and I think that he is mistaken on some fundamental questions; but he at least raises these fundamental questions, which so many of the people who consider themselves Marxists have either been willing to leave in obscurity or have never thought about seriously at all.

Professor Hook is a little academic. Though his expository mechanics are excellent, his language is a little infected with the jargon of technical philosophy—out of place, it seems to me, in books like this, which aim at popularization. And, once having admitted Marx to the pantheon of academic philosophy, he shows a tendency to plane down all his rough surfaces.

That Marx did have a side which relished violence, which may even on good evidence be called sadistic, you would never guess from the moderation and sweet reasonableness which Sidney Hook (in "Towards the Understanding of Karl Marx") seems to attribute to him. And the habitual pettiness, unfairness and virulence of Marx's methods in dealing with his opponents, Professor Hook ignores almost altogether. When he is forced to take notice, in "From Hegel to Marx," of an example of Marx's scurrility, he suggests in a note that "without going to the lengths of Bernstein and Mehring, whose edition of the letters shows signs in places of *political* editing, certain purely personal details in the correspondence of Marx and Engels, set down, in haste, only for their own eyes, could have been judiciously omitted, or, at the very least, made the subject of critical editorial comment." But Bernstein did not merely edit the Marx and Engels letters from a political point of view: he actually rewrote them in such a way as to expurgate them and to tone down the roughness and violence of their language. And it is dangerous to rearrange great men: when you take away the defects of their merits, you upset the equilibrium of real life and impose on people with impossible ideal figures. Besides, Marx's published works are almost as vituperative and scurrilous as his letters. But since, in any case, the Marx-Engels Institute has published the actual text of these letters, it is helpful to have Professor Hook, in "From Hegel to Marx," extricate the sound and rigorous thinking of the Marx of "The Holy Family" and "The German Ideology" from the silly and arrogant carping against Max Stirner and Bruno Bauer and the rest, which disgusted even the good Franz Mehring. This was worth doing, and it took somebody academic to do it. It took, also—what is much more uncommon—a professor with enough courage and independence to occupy himself openly with a subject outlawed by academic philosophy.

Furthermore, Professor Hook, as a sequel to his analysis of Marxism, is beginning to appear in the role of an important critic of Marx. It may be, indeed, that his essay on "Dialectic and Nature" marks a turning-point in Marxist thought. For the object of this essay is nothing less than to call in question Dialectical Materialism as a key to the secrets of the universe. The champions of the Marxist dialectic are in the habit of referring skeptics to the allegedly profound observations of Engels, in "Anti-Dühring" and "Dialectic and Nature," in applying the laws of dialectics to the physical and chemical worlds. Professor Hook, in this essay, has, it seems to me, shown up once for all the absurdity of Engels' pretensions to discover the dialectic in nature. (It must be acknowledged that Engels himself was rather modest about his excursions into the field of the natural sciences.)

Engels imagined that he could see the dialectical processes —the contradiction of the *antithesis* with the *thesis,* the emergence of the *synthesis,* etc.—in the phenomena not only of chemistry and physics, but also of mathematics. He cited, for example, as instances of the working of the dialectic in the essence of things, that water will at certain temperatures change suddenly into steam or ice (the "transition of quantity into quality"); and that, in mathematics, the negation of the negation of a is $+a^2$, "the original positive magnitude, but at a higher level." It is not difficult for Professor Hook to show that the supposed transition from quantity to quality of water turning into steam is relative to the point of view of the observer, because a person from whose point of view the water was concealed in a radiator would be aware of a quite different transition occurring at a different moment, the transition of the temperature of the room from chilliness to comfortable warmth, and neither know nor care whether the water had changed to steam or not; and that the negation of $-a$ is not a^2, but a, whereas if you want to get a^2, you do not have to "negate the negation" at all, but can merely multiply *a plus* by *a plus.* Engels, to be sure, admitted that one had so to "construct the first negation that the second remains or becomes possible." But, as Professor Hook says, since the dialectical materialist has always to provide his own conditions in order to arrive at dialectical results, what becomes of his claim that the dialectic is inherent in all the processes of the universe? The truth is that Engels' pretended instances of the working of the dialectic in nature amount to nothing more important than metaphors, some happy, some pretty far-fetched, which illustrate the Marxist conception of social change.[2]

---

[1] Towards the Understanding of Karl Marx: A Revolutionary Interpretation, by Sidney Hook. New York: The John Day Company. 347 pages. $2.50.

The Meaning of Marx: A Symposium (including statements by Bertrand Russell, John Dewey, Morris R. Cohen and Sherwood Eddy), edited by Sidney Hook. New York: Farrar and Rinehart. 144 pages. $1.

From Hegel to Marx: Studies in the Intellectual Development of Karl Marx, by Sidney Hook. New York: Reynal and Hitchcock. 335 pages. $4.

[2] A different view is presented by the British crystallographer, J. D. Bernal, in a pamphlet called "Engels and Science" (Labor Monthly Pamphlets: London). Professor Bernal asserts that scientific research since Engels' time has strikingly corroborated his claims, citing the transformation of matter into energy involved in the Relativity Theory, the explanation of the different properties

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

(Professor Hook, with his protective attitude toward Marx, tries to pin the responsibility for reading the dialectic into nature on Engels. "Marx himself," he asserts ["From Hegel to Marx," p. 75], never spoke of a *Natur-Dialektik.*" But Paul Lafargue tells us in his "Personal Memories" of Marx that Marx "found again in higher mathematics the dialectical movement in its most logical as well as simplest form. He asserted that no science was truly developed till it was able to make use of mathematics.")

From the moment, however, that we cease to accept the dialectic as a fundamental natural principle animating the physical world, we cast doubt on the inevitability of its operation in human society—or rather, the inevitability of our describing social change in these terms. And we find ourselves driven to recognize that the Marxist dialectic partakes of the mythological character of the German idealistic philosophy in general, against which Marx and Engels believed themselves in full reaction but from which they never completely succeeded in escaping. In preaching a doctrine of the action of the human will on the course of human affairs, they involuntarily evoked a vision of mythological human forces—the Thesis, the Antithesis, and the Synthesis—which were manipulating the destinies of man, so that if we trusted in and opened ourselves to the Antithesis and allowed it to do its work through us, we should surely arrive at the happy state of the Synthesis.

Professor Hook has not as yet pursued this line of criticism very far, and I do not propose to pursue it here. But it should be mentioned that he is evidently not afraid of the further implications of his denial of the metaphysical validity of the laws of dialectics. The "triad" of the dialectic, he says ("From Hegel to Marx," p. 61) "is not logically essential to the method." And he drops the suggestion that this triad may be simply the old Trinity of Christianity carried along into idealist philosophy and taken over in all innocence by Marx and Engels. There need be only *two* phases, says Sidney Hook. But the consequences of destroying the Trinity of the Marxist dialectic may be more serious than Sidney Hook seems to admit.

But now we come to the ground where it seems to me that Professor Hook has not quite done his duty as a critic of the Marxist doctrines.

There is, I believe, a certain variability in the attitude of Marx and Engels toward science. They never, so far as I remember, include it among the intellectual activities of the "superstructure" of their picture of human activity.

Here is a typical description by Marx from the preface to the "Critique of Political Economy" (1859): "Then comes the period of social revolution. With the change of the economic foundation, the entire immense superstructure is more or less rapidly transformed. In considering such transformations, the distinction should always be made between the material transformation of the economic conditions of production, which can be determined with the precision of natural science, and the legal, political, religious, esthetic or philosophical—in short, ideological, forms, in which men become conscious of this conflict and fight it out."

Natural science, then, is not to be numbered among the ideological outgrowths of the superstructure, but has a "precision" of which they are incapable—a precision which social science may share. In what does this precision consist? Engels tells us in "Anti-Dühring" (published, with Marx's approval and a contribution by Marx, in 1878), and his claims for the sciences are humble enough. In those sciences, he says, such as mechanics and physics, which are more or less susceptible of mathematical treatment, one can speak of final and eternal truths, though even in mathematics itself there is plenty of room for uncertainty and error; in the sciences which deal with living organisms, the immutable truths are confined to such platitudes as that all men are mortal and that all female mammals have lacteal glands; and in the sciences which he calls "historical," precision becomes still more difficult: "once we pass beyond the primitive stage of man, the so-called Stone Age, the repetition of conditions is the exception and not the rule, and when such repetitions occur, they never arise under exactly similar conditions," and when "by way of exception, the inner connection between the social and political forms in an epoch comes to be recognized, this only occurs, as a rule, when these forms are already out of date and nearing extinction." And in the sciences which deal with the laws of human thought, logic and dialectics, he adds, the situation is no better.

There is, then, a certain confusion on the part of Marx and Engels about this, as about a number of other things—a confusion which arises not so much from any fundamental lack of intelligence as from a discrepancy between their intelligence and the emphasis which they were led as crusaders to give in practice to certain aspects of their views. In what, according to "Anti-Dühring," should have been a mere tentative formulation of principles which shall make a beginning in enabling the social sciences to approximate to the exactitude, itself only relative and limited, possible for the physical ones, Marx speaks in the "Critique of Political Economy" as if the study of economic conditions were susceptible of the same precision as the study of the natural sciences. Marx and Engels, though they admitted that science was liable to the same delusions as the departments of the ideological superstructure—when, for example, it became befogged with theology—tended to talk about it as if it were something indestructible and pure. For Marx and Engels, their social science was to be used in the interests of the working class; it had been forged by the needs of the working class; yet the object of the social revolution was the establishment of a classless society, so that the science which was to accomplish this end tended to take on a character of universal human truth.

Now it seems to me that one of the principal tasks of the Marxist critic today is to distinguish, among the intellectual products of any given field, which elements—from the point of view of the Marxist picture of reality—are tied directly to the economic basis of life, and which elements belong more properly to the superstructure. The ideological activities of the superstructure were not regarded by Marx and Engels as simply mirroring the social-economic basis. Their vision was a great deal more complicated and had a larger element of idealism than that: they believed that each of these intellectual departments was always struggling to be free and partly succeeded in getting free from its economic tether and to develop a professional group which should be partly independent of class interests; and that these groups acted directly on one another and back on the social-economic basis. So that one would also, in any given case, have to determine how far a law or a political institution as a

---

of the chemical elements in terms of the number of electrons which compose them and of the functions of living bodies in terms of the properties of their molecules, and the microscopical verification of the Mendelian theory of inheritance. But these seem to me to be open to the same kind of objection. All these supposed revolutions depend on the point of view of the observer. Different instruments of measurement would shift the points of transition; better microscopes might abolish altogether the illusion of the transformation of quantity into quality.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

work of art was a product of class delusion and how far it had some larger validity. And certainly the productions of science, including Marxist science, will have to be examined and evaluated in the same way. In fact, the whole Marxist conception of science and its relation to the departments of the superstructure ought to be thoroughly gone into; and this would amount to an overhauling of the whole system.

Professor Hook so far has let himself out of this task by setting scholastic and arbitrary limits to the field in which the dialectic is to be assumed to have some sort of validity (slightly impaired by his criticism though this validity is). The dialectic, says Sidney Hook, is a help in the social sciences; but in the others, not only does it not figure as a genuine principle of nature, but all the principles which *are* valid in Marxism—the influence of class on human thought —do not figure either. The natural sciences may be set aside from all this, they are a domain in which the intellect is really master—in other words, they are an academic abstraction. Marx and Engels, as we have seen, did not really believe this, but, by their emphasis, they make it easy for one of their disciples to believe it.

Yet it is obvious that the sciences are subject to the same kind of distortion through group bias as any other department of human thought, in a way to which Marx and Engels did not give very much attention and which Hook tries to ignore altogether. In disproving the operation of the laws of dialectics in nature ("From Hegel to Marx," p. 76), he seems to me to confuse this question with the different question of how the findings of science are influenced by the class status of the scientist. "The results of physics," he says, "may be used by the bourgeoisie, but there is no such thing as bourgeois physics." But isn't there? If it is true, as Bertrand Russell says, that the chimpanzees of Köhler turned out to be German chimpanzees, because they first reflected with solemnity on the problems presented for their solution and then went forward deliberately to deal with them, whereas the rats of Watson, which rushed around in mazes and then got out after repeated failures by dint of some happy fluke, turned out to be American rats, isn't it equally true that the researches of science show the effects of social pressure? When the director of the Rockefeller Institute smashed the eighty or ninety test-tubes in which Noguchi was carrying on his general experiments which nobody else understood and set him to isolate the syphilis bacillus, he procured, since Noguchi was a genius, the kind of immediate results which the director of the Rockefeller Institute, in the society of which Rockefeller was typical, had to show to the powers that paid him. But suppose Noguchi had been left alone? Who knows what different kind of turn he might have given to bacteriology? And the metaphysics without practical application into which modern physics has fallen?

When Hook touches on the extravagances of the physicists, it is only in some such terms as the following ("From Hegel to Marx," p. 299):

> The alleged independence of the so-called non-existential sciences is due to a failure to relate their fundamental concepts to the concrete situations and concrete activities out of which they grow and to which they must in some form or other be applied. Were Marx alive today, he would trace the flights to mysticism induced by recent work in modern physics to the fundamental methodological error of directly comparing the refined hypothetical results of theory with the crude data of experience.

Now it seems to me that between the first and the second of these sentences, Professor Hook, with his addiction to the philosophical patois, has somehow given us the slip. If the first sentence means what it seems to me it ought to mean, then it is not true, as Professor Hook has said before, that there is no such thing as bourgeois physics; but the second sentence speaks not of fundamental concepts unrelated to concrete situations, but of "flights of mysticism," merely "induced by recent work in modern physics." Isn't it true that mathematics and physics have been following closely in their recent development such developments as Symbolism in literature and Cubism in the plastic arts? If these last have amounted to cloisters amid the bafflement and madness of the capitalist world, the physicists of Southern California, who, like the artist, must live on the patronage of the rich, are inhabiting a cloister no less. It is not that the work done in the cloister may not be of very high value, or that anyone need necessarily be ashamed for taking up his residence in one; but that the cloister itself is partly a product of the pressure of the larger social group. The director of the Rockefeller Institute, who insisted upon practical results, and the modern physicist who never seems to arrive at discovering anything useful because with none of the stimulus to be useful which comes with the hope of human progress, he stops to build a new metaphysical system at the conclusion of every experiment, have corresponded exactly to, say in the field of periodical literature, The Saturday Evening Post and Transition.

And Marxism, the science of history—how have the activities of the Marxists been influenced by their social status, from Marx and Engels themselves to the Stalinist administration in Russia? The real task for the Marxist is to determine the degree to which Dialectical Materialism approximates to general truth and the degree to which it has represented delusions of the ideological superstructure. It seems to me that Sidney Hook, by arbitrarily narrowing the field in which Marxist inquiry is valid and by abstracting the doctrines of Marxism from the personalities and origins of their exponents (so that he is always dealing with its philosophical positions rather than with its practical effects) tended to confine his discussion, illuminating in many respects as it is, within a special academic chamber where it becomes an intellectual game played according to the rules of formal logic. (It is also a feature of Sidney Hook's interpretation to which I would take exception that he seems to suppose that for one who accepts the Marxist fundamentals, it is possible to situate oneself at a point from which it is possible to make a detached decision as to what part one is going to play in a historical situation. If this is true, there is more virtue in the superstructure than I think Marx and Engels thought.)

These remarks of mine are of course very inadequate and raise a great many more questions than they illuminate; but I hope to return to all these matters presently.

EDMUND WILSON.

Northwest Anchorage

Rain on the windshield,
Roads spongy with sawdust
Have meant in the end
A love of place that grows into the body.
Blood should be clear amber under tree bark.

Lacking that, there are the roads
Extending like root tendrils
Under the angles of mountains,
Rain sharpening on the windshield at evening.

MARY BARNARD.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Imperialist by Birth

Politics from Inside: An Epistolary Chronicle, 1906-1914, by Sir Austen Chamberlain. New Haven: Yale University Press. 676 pages. $5.

POWER confers upon the statesman the rare distinction of making his shoptalk inevitably important to the outsider. We may leave the professional gossip of other men to their admiring Boswells but that of the statesman concerns all the rest of us because he deals portentously with the substance of our lives, and his vagaries and limitations are but too apt to turn out to be practical jokes on our destiny. Only power has enough magic to lift the uninspired diary-correspondence of a narrow, snobbish and vain individual like the late Sir Austen Chamberlain from the level of trivia to that of history.

Sir Austen rose in the shadow of his abler father Joseph Chamberlain and missed the prize of his luckier brother Arthur Neville, the present Prime Minister of England. But as Unionist leader, Chancellor of the Exchequer and Foreign Secretary, Sir Austen was for three decades one of the rulers of the empire and, it is not too much to say, of the world. He continued in politics the campaign of his father for a stronger empire knit by internal trade preferences and protected against rivalry by high tariffs and ever greater armaments. Social reform was incomprehensible to Sir Austen. In these letters, written between 1906 and 1914, a period of deep ferment and social legislation, the labor problem is hardly mentioned. The tragedies of the industrial age left him completely cold, but his soul, otherwise so restrained, could boil with indignation at any movement for reform that dared to challenge legality or profane the temple of respectability.

With the sure instinct of his dynasty of intransigent imperialists, Sir Austen knew that dominion, equally at home and abroad, plainly rested on force. Weaken the morale of the army and "the fabric of society is loosened," yield the slightest concession to the colonies and you play into the hands of the extremists. Though willing at long last to compromise on home rule for Ireland, provided only it were ineffective home rule, he insisted that the Irish must by no means be permitted to become welded into a real nation. In India, too, nothing would do but direct coercion. Imperialists more squeamish than himself were frankly reminded by Sir Austen that "our whole position in India rested on the admission that we were different from and in a different position from the natives. We could not admit equality." As for the semi-independent dominions, the fewer commercial relations between them and the outside world, particularly between Canada and the United States, the healthier for the British Empire.

In foreign affairs, the failure of Joseph Chamberlain to neutralize the rivalry of Germany by peaceful understanding was avenged by the devotion of his son to the Triple Entente and his eagerness to accentuate it into a formally binding alliance. In 1911 Sir Austen observed that he could not see how the "restlessness" of Germany was "to be stayed without a deal of blood-letting." He lacked the vision to fear that the blood-letting would drain away the lives of twenty million men and maim twenty-five million, that it would undo the surviving generation and drag the empire it was meant to save close to the point of destruction. Nor did he possess the hindsight and decency to recognize his own substantial share in the awful responsibility. For one who had written before the War that "there was no pleasure in the world" like sitting in the Cabinet and "feeling you were helping to direct the policy of your country and make her history," it must have been a considerable relief to be able to rationalize, after the War, that "there was less of deep-laid plot and counterplot and more of improvisation in the actions of rulers and Cabinets than the historian was apt to admit."

Perhaps, but then the improvisers had better show more talent or they will again jeopardize their precious careers, and ruin the world into the bargain. Unwittingly, Sir Austen has penned in this correspondence his own indictment and the indictment of the whole social caste to which he was so proud to belong.

SOLOMON F. BLOOM.

Pan's Parlor Game

Selected Poems, by Edith Sitwell. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company. 285 pages. $3.

THERE are a good many anomalies in Miss Sitwell's poetry, which in the essay that prefaces this volume she tries to explain and justify. She first postulates that her world is a country world. It is variously seen as a rococo dream world of the eighteenth century; as a world of the peasant, sensual and bemired; and finally as a world of "primeval innocence," of

> Strange long past fruit-hairy springs,
> Beginnings of first earthy things.

These three aspects of her country world appear to represent respectively her nostalgia for an ordered life of elegant beauty, her rebellion against life as it is—

> Making an endless battle without hope
> Against materialism and the world . . .

—and her awareness, also nostalgic, of spiritual potentialities. One is faintly surprised to find her subject matter so conventional. Her obscurity, of course, lies in her expression.

This she tries to explain by suggesting that "all expression is welded into an image, not removed into a symbol that is inexact, or squandered into a metaphor." At her best in the imagistic vein, her verse is brilliant and precise:

> Beside the sea, metallic bright
> And sequined with the noisy light
> Duennas slowly promenade
> Each like a patch of sudden shade.

But Miss Sitwell is by no means a strict Imagist. An image is singular in content as distinguished from the often multiple meanings of a symbol; it is invariable and equates only with itself. Miss Sitwell's images, recurring from poem to poem, vary, overlap and accrete new significance. For example, she writes of "the dark hairiness of bestial skies," or of "the sensual aspects of the hairy sky." This occurs in a passage about the peasant world; the "hairy sky" is the sky of the blind sensual world. The word is used frequently with like implications. But it is also used to describe fuzzy leaves. Then it is used to characterize the springs that are "the beginnings of first earthy things," thus overlapping into the world of "primeval innocence." And finally, Miss Sitwell tells us that her yellow-petticoated nymphs, so characteristic of her eighteenth-century gardens, are an embodiment of these "fruit-hairy springs." In the end, "hairy" becomes associated with all

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

three worlds, and its precision breaks down entirely. The confusion stems from the fact that Miss Sitwell uses at least three different techniques, apparently indiscriminately: imagism, symbolism and impressionism.

The most inexact and illuminating statement Miss Sitwell makes about her obscurity is that her "senses are like those of primitive peoples, at once acute and uncovered." Her senses are, of course, acute—acutely cultivated to the extreme limits of verbal sophistication. She also explains that they are "interchangeable," and refers one to the theory of "correspondences" inherited from Swedenborg through Baudelaire. Carrying this idea one step further, she senses a process of metamorphosis in the plant and animal worlds. Rilke held this belief and for him it became a means to profound integration, as it did also for Goethe. For them it was a spiritual conviction; for Miss Sitwell it is an idea.

Intellectually restless, she is obsessed with materials rather than meanings. She finds that "words ending in *ck* cast little almost imperceptible shadows." Other words are shadeless. Certain letters send "a gust of wind" through a line; others only "a little cold air." Some words are shadows reversed, or upside down, of other words. Consonants and vowels have a life of their own; they shrink, shudder, leap, contract with cold, disintegrate like dust, or again like rotten flesh. Phrases have their own meanings in their sound. Thus, by "decoy-duck dust" is meant "very thick dry dust," and so on. The exhaustive analysis of word sounds and their associations is a fascinating introduction to Miss Sitwell's unique sensibilities. The obvious drawback as regards her poetry is exactly that they are unique. One gets the final impression that her poetry is a kind of sophisticated parlor game, a guessing game, in which Miss Sitwell furnishes a few examples of the secret principle by which the game works, and then leaves her readers to work it out. The winner is clearly the one who is most familiar with Miss Sitwell's sensibilities. It is very good fun, on occasion, for the sheer sound of her lines, but it is hard to think of it as important. PHILIP HORTON.

Ancient History in China

The Birth of China: A Survey of the Formative Period of Chinese Civilization, by Herrlee Glessner Creel. New York: Reynal and Hitchcock: A John Day Book. 402 pages. $3.75.

SOME FIFTEEN years ago a colleague of mine said that the history of China must be rewritten with a shovel and spade, and not with a pen today. In the fifteen years that have elapsed, a number of things have happened that are going to revolutionize Chinese history completely. These are the excavations by scientists of the Peking Man, the discovery of the Yang Shao culture (distinguished by its extremely fine painted pottery) and of the black pottery culture in ancient Shantung, the unearthing of about three hundred ancient Shang tombs together with important finds including marble statuary of the finest quality, and finally the bringing to light of a great quantity of bone inscriptions, generally belonging to the second millennium B. C. The discovery of these bone inscriptions (which really started some three decades ago) is an event of first-rate importance for Chinese scholars, in that the inscriptions represent our earliest direct historical sources today and that in their form of writing they bring us to a stage in the evolution of the Chinese script unknown before. Very intensive and extensive work has been done on these bone inscriptions by Chinese scholars and, beginning in 1928-29, Chinese Western-trained scientists for the first time carried on scientific excavations with the modern technique. There exists then an entirely new set of source materials for the origins of Chinese history, the majority of which are available only in Chinese.

In the author of this book we have a scholar who, working for four years in constant touch with the Chinese scholars and taking pains to go back directly to Chinese sources exclusively, has brought this tremendous amount of material within the reach of English-speaking people—a scholar who has in addition the gift of combining conscientiousness of scholarship with lucidity of style.

The matter of the recent excavations at Anyang and other places has already attracted the attention of Western scientists. The discoveries (notably those in connection with the ancient Pleistocene man in ancient Asia) carried on by Chinese and Western scientists are of the utmost importance in their bearing on the rise of Chinese civilization. The excitement, the drama and romance of these excavations, however, are little known. The richness of the materials lying underground is matched only by the utter stupidity, vandalism and speed with which they are being destroyed by mercenary curio-dealers working in conjunction with the ignorant farmers. Bronzes of undoubted antiquity have constantly come to light and have appeared in the Peiping market with no possibility of dating them scientifically; entire tombs have been robbed and their sets of vessels separated and sold piecemeal; I have seen parts of an ancient chariot happily rescued by Chinese scientists from sites already ransacked by the peasants. It was only in the years after 1929 that the Chinese National Research Institute of Nanking was able to arrange with the government to put a stop to these private diggings, and Dr. Li Chi, a graduate of the Harvard School of Anthropology, was able to carry on his excavations, even then surrounded by hostility and danger. From the richness of what has been discovered in a short period, one is constantly led to think of what is *not* being done, and what still lies underground awaiting our discovery. Entire cities have been buried by the changing course of the Yellow River; several royal mausoleums have accidentally come to light and their contents been hopelessly dispersed; in Sian, for instance, one cannot take a walk outside the city without kicking up tiles two thousand years old, or dig a well without hitting upon the roof of some man long dead.

In this book, Mr. Creel covers the period 1400-600 B.C., telling, chapter by chapter, the story of livelihood, war, writing, literature, sacrifice, marriage, family, the business and enjoyment of life and the political constitution of the Shang and Chou times. Chapter III, dealing with the origins of Chinese civilization (although slightly more technical), and the last chapter on the Decree of Heaven should be of the utmost interest to the general reader. The chapter on early Chinese writing is also written with some extremely well chosen examples. I am no archeologist, but I am perhaps sufficiently familiar with the sources and problems discussed in the various chapters to have faith in the author's general competence and reliability. It is not impossible, in fact it is to be expected, that further excavations in the next ten years will shed more light on these problems and revise our opinions on the various subjects. This book, for instance, could not have been written seven years ago. We ought to be grateful that we have met a readable, lucid and reliable volume, bringing together the results of Chinese scholarly research literally up to the date of the writing, and consequently superseding all previous works bearing on the same period. LIN YUTANG.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Seeing America First

Washington: City and Capital, compiled by the Federal Writers' Project of the Works Progress Administration. Washington: Government Printing Office. 1,140 pages. $3.

LESS THAN a century ago, Charles Dickens, on a visit to this country, found that a few simple and well chosen words were sufficient to describe the National Capital. It was then a city of "spacious avenues that begin in nothing and lead nowhere; streets a mile long that only want houses, roads and inhabitants; public buildings that need but a public to be complete"—in short, Washington was a "monument to a deceased project." That was in 1842. The publication this spring of "Washington: City and Capital," a guidebook gone encyclopedic, makes Dickens seem a very bad prophet indeed. Here, in a volume of 400,000 words, written and edited by the District of Columbia unit of the Federal Writers' Project, is the greatest amount of information about the Capital ever assembled in one volume. Comprehensively and comprehensibly, the book records the dramatic history and the social, cultural and material aspects of a city that now has nearly 600,000 inhabitants.

Fourteen essays present the general background of the Capital, including its topography and climate, its flora and fauna, its history and its culture. It is evident that much painstaking research and a great variety of editorial talents were expended in the compilation; for the text is lively or pedestrian by paragraphs. At least four of the essays—"Architecture," "The Negro in Washington," "Art" and "Literature"—depart from the conventional and prosaic style that might be expected. From these pages personalities emerge, viewing here with keen appreciation, there with tongue in cheek, and arriving at conclusions that are usually frank and pungent but not always infallible. In sharp phrase and simple style the essay on architecture surveys the Capital, noting the "haughty and uncompromising splendor" of the Supreme Court, condoning the "legitimate monumentality" of the Archives Building, and characterizing the State, War and Navy Building as "a historic monument that comes close to being a universal compendium of architectural errors." Perhaps the most significant contribution to the volume is the dreary portrait of the Washington Negro, who has "no voice in government, is economically proscribed, and segregated nearly as rigidly as in the Southern cities he contemns."

The second section describes Washington today, its public buildings, monuments, libraries, art galleries, museums, historic houses, churches and universities. Still another part of the volume describes the functions of the various government departments and agencies. Another gives a series of tours through the city and its environs, with numerous cross-references to points of interest described elsewhere in the book. Three large color maps are included, certainly among the best that are available to the visitor.

Perhaps the volume is too heavy and awkward—and too full of material—ever to be popular as a guidebook, but it is extremely valuable as a work of reference. Moreover, it has served in the editorial training and technical evolution of the Federal Writers' Project. It is the second of the large volumes to be published in the American Guide Series, which will eventually include forty-eight state guides, a guide to New York City, a six-volume regional guide to the United States, a series of books describing transcontinental tours and many local and sectional guides—all designed to disseminate a wider knowledge and a keener appreciation of America's historical, geographical and cultural past and present.

KATHRYN COE CORDELL.

The Return of Peer Gynt

The Ring Is Closed, by Knut Hamsun. Translated by Eugene Gay-Tifft. New York: Coward-McCann. $2.50.

THE TITLE itself ("Ringen Sluttet") has a valedictory note, and we must take it that this is Hamsun's final word. He himself declares that this last novel "is the best thing I have done," and it is an extremely interesting and rather puzzling book. With superb imaginative ease Hamsun creates his scene, the dreary little Norwegian coastal town, and its riffraff, its bourgeoisie, its old folk and its young folk. The town and its inhabitants are presented with almost hallucinatory vividness. In the sense that Hamsun aims at no single effect of story-telling, the novel may be called plotless; but it is continuously engrossing.

And very puzzling. Hamsun apparently holds up for our sympathy the character named Abel—the antithesis of the average Western man. He repudiates work, ambition, economy, success: his ideal of living is to lie under a tropic sun and doze. He has all the simplicity, without any of the saintliness, of the Dostoevskian Idiot. In his Norwegian home he feels rootless and restless, but we gather that he would feel much the same wherever he was. He is a sailor bored by the sea, a tramp bored by the road. With absolute lack of will, he is completely unconcerned. When an irate husband, whom Abel has been languidly cuckolding, catches him *in flagrante delicto* and shoots at him, Abel begins to put on his shoes and remarks: "Seems to me that's my revolver you've got in your hand." There's nothing heroic, or tragic, or even comic about Abel. And he is not at all unhappy. He simply doesn't care to be bothered by life.

Hamsun seems to admire his Abel, but the character is so utterly negative, so odd and so remote from anything that is admirable in the West, that, if one happens to be a conscientious reviewer, one reads the book over again to find if one has missed the point, and then one concludes that there is no point at all. There is only the Hamsunian, or perhaps the Norwegian, Attitude, which remains a puzzle; and a last novel by a scrupulous artist, written with all the effortless fidelity and inner quietude at the heart of its action of a painting by an old master.

MICHAEL SAYERS.

Restless Life

Burton of Arabia, by Seton Dearden. New York: Robert R. McBride and Company. 334 pages. $3.

THE BIOGRAPHER of a personality as complex as that of Sir Richard Burton encounters as many rockslides and quagmires and pitfalls as that intrepid explorer himself did in his wanderings in the jungles and deserts of four continents. It is almost impossible to write of such a man without errors. Seton Dearden has fallen down in only one respect, and that is due either to carelessness or to lack of preparation in his ethnological background. He is inexact in his description of the Druses, for example, and does not seem to realize that Arnout and Albanian are interchangeable terms. In another respect, the author has shown splendid insight. He has realized that the friendship between Sir Richard Burton and Algernon Charles Swinburne was a high spot in the lives of both.

Burton was distrusted by the English officials because of his frankness. He believed that homosexuality was a matter of climate rather than of race, and his report on the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

masculine brothels of Karachi shocked the Foreign Office. Other unorthodox views, such as his belief in polygamy, were also against him; therefore, in spite of his remarkable gift for languages and his other exceptional qualities, he was denied a chance to explore with adequate means. On his pilgrimage to Mecca he learned of the incipient Sepoy mutiny which broke forth two years later; the Government neglected his warning, as it did a later one advising of perils to Christians in Syria.

Sir Richard Burton's marriage was a symbol of his maladjustment to the age in which he was born. Isabel Arundel was a descendant of an old Catholic family, who desired social distinction and a respectable sanctity. When she was not attempting to convert her husband and the Moslems of Damascus, or nagging him, she kept bombarding influential people to obtain promotion for him. She dreamed, as her husband did, of the mysterious Orient, but his vision was that of Marco Polo or of Camoens—his idea of a reality and a sensual paradise; Lady Burton imagined the Orient that Lord Byron's poetry and Disraeli's "Tancred" had invented and modified to Victoria's taste. In spite of the great love between them, she understood her husband so little that, as soon as his restless life came to a close, she burned his diary and his unpublished translation of Arabic erotica.

JOE GOULD.

Contributors

EDGAR SNOW is the author of "Far Eastern Front" and a newspaperman of long experience in China. He is one of the few foreigners to travel into Soviet China and the first journalist to report on conditions there. His new book, "Red Star of China," will be published by Random House in the fall.

EDWARD S. CORWIN is the McCormick Professor of Jurisprudence at Princeton University and the author of a great many books and articles dealing with American history and politics. He was awarded the honorary degree of Litt.D. by Harvard University on the occasion of its Tercentenary.

LIDDELL HART is a well known British expert on military affairs. His article is a chapter from his book, "Europe in Arms," to be published in the near future by Random House. This chapter was cabled from Europe after the book was on the press.

MARGUERITE YOUNG is the author of "Prismatic Ground," a book of verse recently published by Macmillan.

MARY BARNARD is a young poet who lives in Vancouver, Washington.

SOLOMON F. BLOOM teaches Modern European History at Brooklyn College. He is engaged on a study of the attitude of Karl Marx toward the modern nation.

PHILIP HORTON is the author of "Hart Crane, The Life of an American Poet" and a contributor to The New Republic, The Southern Review and The New Masses.

LIN YUTANG, after having spent the past year in the United States, living in an apartment in New York City, is soon to return to his native China by way of England and Europe. He is the author of "My Country and My People."

KATHRYN COE CORDELL was co-editor of "American Points of View," "Anthology of Pulitzer Prize Plays" and "Molders of American Thought."

MICHAEL SAYERS was dramatic critic of A. R. Orage's New English Weekly. His short stories have appeared in "Best British Short Stories" and he has contributed to periodicals both here and in England.

JOE GOULD, historian and poet, has for some years been devoting his attention to assembling a history of the world from oral sources.

What is your stand on the SOVIET UNION Today?

Are you a disillusioned radical?
Are you a Utopian liberal?
Are you shocked by recent events in Soviet Russia?
Are you a fair-weather friend?

For a forthright and stirring answer to the critics of recent events in Soviet Russia, read: "Faith in the Soviet Union," by Corliss Lamont, noted writer and lecturer, in

the AUGUST Issue of

SOVIET RUSSIA TODAY

now on newsstands 15c a copy

If your bookstore or newsstand cannot supply you, send to *SOVIET RUSSIA TODAY*, 324 Broadway, N. Y. C.

WAS IT A WRITERS' CONGRESS?

John Chamberlain says 'NO!'

. . . in the August *Common Sense:* "I had a very good reason for not attending the Congress of American Writers. I am a democrat and a radical—but . . . "

Don't miss this honest analysis of the issue that is splitting the ranks of American writers wide open. Order NOW!

This issue: 25c; 6 Months: $1. To *Common Sense*, 315 4th Ave., N. Y.

GREEN MANSIONS
A Complete Modern Camp for Adults in the Adirondacks

New 22-room Club-house, each room with private bath
Private golf course, tennis courts handball courts, and all other sports facilities
Professional Theatrical Company
Chamber Music
Full Schedule of Rates on Request.
LENA BARISH SAM GARLEN
Directors
New York City Office—11 W. 42 St.
Telephone BRyant 9-1733

GREEN MANSIONS
WARRENSBURG N.Y.

Write for advertising rates to The New Republic, 40 East 49th St., New York City

RESORTS

The Sophistication of a Smart Country Club...The Convenience of a Modern Hotel. All land and water sports...18 hole golf course...11 piece orchestra.
The CEDARS COUNTRY CLUB LAKEVILLE Connecticut

SILVER BIRCHES, Canton, Maine. For discriminating women who want a quiet place that offers boating and bathing in secluded and beautiful lake. Cabins with sanitary plumbing. Excellent table. Rates: $15 to $20. Booklet.

RIVERSIDE INN on Lake Housatonic. Swimming, boating, tennis; 1¾ hours from New York. July week-ends, $3.00 per day. $19.00 weekly. Station Derby. P. O. Seymour, Conn. Tel. Derby 598-12.

QUIET restful house (with cottages) two and half hours from New York still has few rooms available. Excellent beds and food. Rates on request. Restricted. The Bartram Inn, Sharon, Conn.

FROM A MOSCOW MUSEUM
FREE EXHIBIT
Of beautiful reproductions by Soviet technicians from the French section of the MUSEUM of MODERN WESTERN ART in MOSCOW. Admission Free.
WORKERS BOOKSHOP
50 East 13th Street New York City

LITERARY HELP

RESEARCH WORK, GHOST WRITING by editors of reputation. Our research and literary staff is equipped to handle the literary needs of students, professionals and business men. Theses, speeches, articles, biographies, difficult letters at truly moderate rates. **SLOANE-PARKER LITERARY SERVICE, Studio 5-F, 30 Fifth Avenue, New York City, GRamercy 5-6143**

CORRESPONDENCE CLUBS

OUR CLEVER MODERN inventors create many nice designs for living, but there is no substitute for a REAL FRIEND. Enclose 3c stamp. **CONTACTS, Box 91 Station D, New York City.**

LANGUAGES

LANGUAGE PHONE SETS. Bought, sold, rented, exchanged. Language Service, 507 5th Avenue, N. Y.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED